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ANIMADVERSIONS

UPON

Monsieur Le Clerc's Reflections

UPON

Our Saviour and his Apostles, &c.

Sect. I.

Of Monsieur Le Clerc's Reflections upon our Saviour, and his Apostles, and other divinely inspired Persons.

When I first looked into our Monsieur's Supplement to Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament, I was strangely surprized, seeing him fall so foul upon a Person of so great Learning, and exemplary Piety and Modesty. I could not but debate within my self, what it might be that moved him to be so strangely rude and severe upon one, whom in his Letter before
before his Supplement, p. 5. and 11. he acknowledges to have been a pious and learned Man, and also a very skilful Divine, an excellent Grecian, and likewise Hebrician. In the same Letter, p. 7. and 10. he would persuade us that he writ for the defence of Christ and his Apostles and immortal Truth; but this is sufficiently confuted by the manner of his writing, as well as the subject-matter of it. These give too much cause to fear, that it was Emulation that moved him to it, because Dr. Hammond excell'd him in that which he values himself so much upon, being a greater Master of the true Ars Critica than our Monsieur is. But when I found that he was neither ashamed nor afraid to reflect upon our Saviour himself and his Apostles, together with other divinely inspired Persons and Pen-men of Holy Writ, I resolved to trouble my self no further with that Enquiry; for it cannot be thought strange, if he, who spares not our blessed Saviour and his Apostles, and other inspired persons, do take the liberty to reflect so rudely upon Dr. Hammond and other Writers, both Ancient and Modern. I shall therefore begin with his Reflections upon them.
Monsieur Le Clerc's Reflections.

1. Reflections upon our Blessed Saviour, Pag. 86. in S. Matth. 25. 4.

There is not such a perfect decorum kept in Parables, as that every thing in them is an allusion to what was generally practised. This appears sufficiently from this place; for those that used Lamps, did not for one night, besides the Oyl that was in their Lamps, carry Oyl in another Vessel, with which they might supply their Lamps that same night; but they filled their Lamp once for the whole night. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadver.

A little prudence would have taught our Monsieur so much caution, as not to have reflected upon our Saviour for not observing a Decorum in Parables, unless he could have proved otherwise than he hath done, that our Lord did not. He pretends that it appears sufficiently from this place, viz. S. Matth. 25. 4. For (says he) those that did use Lamps, did not for one night, besides the Oyl that was in their Lamps, carry Oyl in another Vessel. But how doth our Monsieur know, or who told him that they did not? or what Testimonies
animadversions upon

Admonitions doth he produce out of approved Writers to satisfy us that they did not? None at all, and therefore this that he says is as easily rejected, as it is offered. On the other hand, if any one should affirm that it was the practise in our Saviour's time, that they did for one night carry Oyl in their Vessels, besides that which was in their Lamps; this Parable alone is a sufficient proof of it. The blessed Jesus knew both the practise of that time, and how to observe a perfect Decorum in Parables, better than our Monsieur doth. In the mean time is it not strange, that any one should have the confidence to say, that our Saviour doth not observe a perfect Decorum in this Parable S. Matth. 25. when he hath no better ground for it than a conceit of his own, which he can never prove, and therefore he never goes about to prove it.

P. 88. in S. Matth. 25. 24.

In this part of the Parable there is no Decorum at all observ'd, for no Servant or Client would dare to speak at this rate to his Master or Patron.—It must be observ'd also, that this part of the Parable is but as the παράγωγον, or that which serves to fill up in a Picture; for there is nothing to an-
swer
Monsieur Le Clere's Reflections.

fewer it in the 3s3ors, or mystical sense. All that Christ meant by it is, that no excuse will be admitted for those who do not make a good use of the favours they have receiv'd. Thus Monsieur Le Clere.

Animadu.

In the former Reflection our Monsieur was more modest, saying only that there was not a perfect Decorum in our Saviour's Parables; but here he tells us with great confidence, that in a part of one of his Parables there is no Decorum at all observ'd, and that it is but as that which serves to fill up in a Picture; and that more notice may be taken of them, these words Fill up and Picture are printed in a different Character. And yet he presently contradicts this, saying that Christ meant by that part of the Parable, that no excuse will be ad-

mitted for those who do not make a good use of the favours they have received. Now if Christ meant this by it, how could our Monsieur say that in the sense or design of the Parable, there is nothing to answer it, and that it is only as that which serves to fill up in a Picture? But I add, that our Saviour intended more than that which our Monsieur takes notice of, viz. that many times that which Men alledge for them-

selves
elves by way of excuse, doth render them inexcusable, so that they are condemn'd out of their own mouths.

Our Monsieur says, that no Client would dare to speak at this rate to his Patron. But what have we to do here with Patron and Client? Patron and Clients are not mention'd in the Parable, Master and Servants are; and we know that Servants will reply very quaintly to their Lords or Masters, and we may wonder the less at it, when our Monsieur dares speak of our dear Lord and Master at such a strange rate as he doth.

2. Reflections upon the Apostles,

P. 12. in S. Matth. 2. 15.

You will no where find it said, that the Prophecies ought so or so to be interpreted, because the Apostles, who were inspired by the Holy Ghost, and whose doctrine God confirm'd by Miracles, did in that manner interpret them; but they take every-where for granted that they should be so explain'd, as they explain'd them from the received Opinion amongst the Jews. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
I would know what our Monsieur's meaning is, when he tells us, that we shall nowhere find it said, that Prophecies ought so or so to be interpreted, because the Apostles, who were divinely inspired, and had their doctrine confirmed by Miracles, did interpret them so. If it be, that we shall nowhere find it said in the Scripture, I answer, that likewise it is nowhere said in Scripture, that they should be explain'd so as the Apostles explain them from the receiv'd Opinion among the Jews. If our Monsieur reply that it is not indeed said, but it is everywhere taken for granted, I ask, By whom? He says, This they take everywhere for granted; But what is the Antecedent to this, They here? for I have sought for an Antecedent but in vain. Perhaps our Monsieur's meaning is, not that we shall nowhere find it said in Scripture, but that it is nowhere said in any other Writings, that Prophecies ought to be so interpreted, as the Apostles, who were divinely inspir'd, have interpreted them. If this be his meaning, I must tell him, that he has not read all other Writings so carefully and attentively, as to be able to pronounce that this or that is nowhere said.
in them. I must tell him also, that he is much mistaken, for I believe there are few that have had occasion to write of this Subject, viz. the interpretation of the Prophecies of the Old Testament, who have not said it. I shall only allude \textit{Lud. Crocius}, tho' if there was necessity, I could produce many more. In his \textit{Syntagma}, l. i. c. 7. where he treats of the Interpretation of Scripture, having divided it into Ordinary and Extraordinary, and said of the latter, that it is altogether infallible, he gives Examples of it in the words immediately following: \textit{Sic cum Deus ipse posterioribus verbis docet quid prioribus sense-rit, cumque Apostoli extraordinaria & prophetica certitudine explicant quis fit sensus veterum Prophetarum; So Crocius.} So that, according to him, the Infallibility of the Apostles interpretation of the Prophecies was owing (not to their explaining them from the receiv'd Opinion among the Jews, but) to their being extraordi-
narily and prophetically inspired.

But further, if this, that Prophecies are to be so explain'd as the Apostles explain'd them from the receiv'd Opinion amongst the Jews, be so to be understood, as that, if the Apostles explain'd them, but not from the receiv'd Opinion among the Jews, their Explication was not to be receiv'd or fol-
follow'd, the Authority of the Apostles signifies nothing; it is the receiv'd Opinion among the Jews which is the Rule, by which we must judge of their Interpretations; and if we know not what the receiv'd Opinion among the Jews was, we cannot know whether the Apostles explain the Prophecies rightly or not. And if this be not to reflect upon the Apostles, and detract from their Authority, I would know what is. And accordingly our Monsieur tells us in the sentence immediately preceding, that the Authority of the Apostles ought not here to be objected, as that which added strength to their Reasonings; for they themselves did not rely upon their own Authority, but upon the force of their Arguments. But, 1. Ought not our Monsieur to have proved that the Apostles rely'd upon the force of their Arguments, and not upon their Authority? 2. I conceive that it is safest to say, that they rely'd upon that which was the foundation of their Authority, and to which the strength and force of their Arguments was owing, viz. the especial assistance of the Blessed Spirit of God. That S. Paul rely'd upon this, his own words do fully assure me, 1 Cor. 7.40. And I think that I have the Spirit of God. Because of this especial assistance of the Holy Spirit of God so great deference
is paid, and so great Authority ascribed to the Apostles, by all good Christians, who do believe that Prophecies are to be so interpreted as they interpreted them, whether they explain’d them from the receiv’d Opinion among the Jews or not.

P. 398. in Gal. 2, 6.

It is very true what our Author here says about S. Paul’s Solacisms, which others, using a softer term, call seeming Solacisms. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

Why might not our Monsieur have follow’d the Example of those who use the softer term? especially when he saw Origen so cautious as to use it in Philologia, cap. 8. S. Hierome Comment. in Eph. 3. expresses the like Caution, when he says, Solacismos aut tale quid; he thought it would sound harshly if he said Solacismos, without adding any thing to mollify it, and therefore he says Solacismos, or something like them. But this is not our Monsieur’s way, he is for the harsher term, S. Paul’s Solacismos, without the addition of any thing to soften it. There is then no remedy, S. Paul must be guilty of Solacisms;
lacies, and, according to our Monsieur, the Examples allleged by Dr. Hammond put the matter out of all doubt. We must therefore examine them.

The first that is produced by that learned Person is, Col. i. 10. where after περιέθικαν ὑμᾶς, some words interposing, the construction is altered, and goes on with καρποφόρενας καὶ αὐξημένους; Thus Dr. Hammond in Gal. 2. 6. Note d. But here is no difficulty, for καρποφόρενας and αὐξημένους being construed with τελεσθήσαι in vers. 9. and τε

επιλαμβάνοιν ὑμᾶς αὖθις τῷ Κυρίῳ τις πᾶσαν ἀρε

σκευαν being inclos'd in a Parenthesis, the Construction is regular enough. Add here-
to, that there is not the word ὑμᾶς either in the Alexandrian MS. or in Lincoln Colleges MS. and so the very ground and foundation of the difficulty is taken away.

The second Example is Col. 3. 16. where after ὁ λόγος σιουκεῖτο ὑμῖν, &c. the construc-
tion is soon altered into διδασκόντης καὶ μηνύοντες; Thus Dr. Hammond, Ibid. But here likewise, if we include ὁ λόγος τῷ Χρι-
sτῷ σιουκεῖτο ὑμῖν πλεοσίων in a Parenthes-
sis, or if we understand the Verb Sub-
stantive (which is usual) or repeat the Verb ἰσαποθετείναι, which we have in the end of vers. 15. the Construction will be well enough.

The
The third place is Eph. 3. 17, where after χαλκοῦν τον Χριστόν did this πάνω ον ταις καρδίαις ημῶν follows v. 18, ἐφεξῆς δέ, καὶ τεκμελιωμένοι; Thus Dr. Hammond, Ibid. But here is no difficulty at all, for if with S. Ambrose (or him that bears his name) Oecumenius, or Photius ap. Oecumen, Anselm, our Translators, Beza, Grotius, &c. we admit of a Trajectio of the word ινα, rendering the Sentence as if it was before, ἐφεξῆς δέ, thus; That ye being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all Saints, &c. all is plain. We readily admit of such a Transposition of ινα in other places of S. Paul's Epistles, as also in S. Joh. 13. 29. and therefore why any do scruple it here I know not.

The fourth Example is Eph. 4. 1, 2, 3, where after οὕτως ἔξως περιπατήσαι, &c. v. 1. follows ἀρχήν θεοῦ, v. 2. and σωτῆρος, v. 3. which doth not regularly cohere with it; Thus Dr. Hammond, Ibid. But the Author of the Syriac Version believed that the Verb Substantive was understood, and accordingly he hath taken care to supply it both in the 2d and 3d Verse.

The fifth is Eph. 2. 1, where after ὑμᾶς ὑλικὰς νεκρὸς τοῖς παραπλημμασί καὶ τοῖς ἀμαρτίασι there follows a long Parenthesis to v. 4. by which means the Verb which should govern ὑμᾶς
Monsieur Le-Clerc's Reflections.

Thus Dr. Hammond, Ibid. But if instead of looking forward to v. 5. of this 2d Chapter, Dr. Hammond and other Expositors had look'd backward to the 20th Verse of the 1st Chapter, they would have perceiv'd, both that there is no need of that Parenthesis, and that the word is not omitted which governs yuas. For the Conjunction et, couples aut, Chap. 1. v. 20. and yuas, Chap. 2. 1.; and as aut is govern'd of yuas, so both yuas refer to it. God raised him (i.e. Christ) and you, or (as the Syriac hath it) also you. And the excellent Order or Contexture of the Apostle's discourse is very observable, God (says he) raised Christ from the dead, and set him at his right hand in the heavenly places, Chap. 1. 20. And he hath raised you (i.e. you Ephesians) being dead in trespasses and sins, Chap. 2. 1. And he hath also quickened and raised us, and set us in the heavenly places, Chap. 2. 5, 6. By Us here we may understand either Us believers at Rome (for S. Paul writ this Epistle there) or Us believing Jews.

The sixth Example is Eph. 3. 1. where (says Dr. Hammond, Ibid.) εις Παύλου hath no Verb following it. But the same learned Person hath furnished us with two Answers to this. 1. He says that some have suppos'd that here is an Ellipsis, and they suppose...
supply it thus. For this cause I Paul am the Prisoner of Christ Jesus for you Gentiles. And it is true that Erasmus, Cajetan, Bucer, Gagaeus, Musculus, Beza, Tironius and others do supply the Verb Sum, as also Anselm did long before them. And S. Chrysostome favours this, when he gives the sense of the place in other words thus, Did τοι ἐμέ ἐκείνον. To all these I add the Syriac Version, where the latter ἐσμαι is put for a Verb Substantivé, and therefore the Latin interpretation of that Version hath rightly rendered it Ego Paulus vinculus sum. I know that Dr. Hammond saith, that there are many inconveniences consequent to this rendering; but he do's not acquaint us what those inconveniences are; and so we cannot judge of them. 2. Dr. Hammond also directs us to look forward to v. 14. S. Paul lays here, v. 1. For this cause I Paul and the prisoner of Christ; and then v. 14. For this cause I bow my knees; so that it is as if he had said, For this cause, I say for this cause I Paul and the prisoner of Christ bow my knees. Our Montfleur would have look'd upon this as an elegancy in an Hea-then Writer. This way of Solving the seeming difficulty is approved by Iaffins, and others, and also favoured by Theodoret. These Answers might suffice, yet I add a Third. One of Stephanus's Copies
Copies here add more, Am an Embassa-
dour, see also Calvin. Varialbus and Calvin
seem to have follow'd this or a like Copy.
The seventh Example is Gal. 2. 4. where
having begun the period with δι ον πε-
period. &c. Some words intervening by way
of Parenthesis to the end of the Verse, the
sense begun is not finished, but instead of it
ος οδε ολης δοκούν εικαν, v. 5. Thus Dr. Ham-
mond, Ibid. But here is no difficulty, for
if with Beza we render it, Nempe propter
irreptitios, or with our Translators, And
that because of false brethren, or (as Dr. Ham-
mond himself renders it in his Margin) But
this by reason of false brethren, all is plain;
for so this, v. 4. refers to that which goes
before, v. 3. and withall, there is no neces-
sity of a Parenthesis. The Apostles mean-
ing is plainly this, He would not consent
that Titus should be circumcised, because
of false brethren, who would have brought
them into bondage, and therefore he re-
folv'd that he would not yield to them in
the least.
The last Example is Gal. 2. 6. where the
period being begun δι την δοκούν, &c.
(by which it appears that oun ελαγοσ, or
somewhat like it was design'd to be joyn'd to
it) after the interposing of a Parenthesis, the
sense is begun again in another form, εινι
ει δοκούνς οδε δοκούνειν ιερός. Thus Dr. Ham-
mond,
Thus I have consider'd all the Examples produced by Dr. Hammond, and am far from being of our Monsieur's opinion, that they put the matter of S. Paul's Solacisms out of all doubt in his sense. Yea, on the other hand, it appears from this View of them, that I have now taken, that it is not so easy to find instances of Solacisms in his Stile, as some have imagined. Who yet did not make it their business to expose this great Apostle as our Monsieur doth, but to collect a number of inconsequences and incoherences out of the best Authors, both Greek and Latin, to shew, that S. Paul's stile ought not therefore to be accounted the less elegant. But with these our Monsieur is very much displeased, telling them, that these Authors are ill compared with S. Paul. i.e. that they do those Greek and Latin Authors much wrong.
wrong in comparing them with S. Paul. For, 1. The Discourses of those Authors have all those Ornaments, which are requisite to make them proper and elegant: On the other hand, S. Paul's style is destitute of all those things, which are so much admired and commended in a Discourse. 2. The most elegant Heathen Writers do designedly sometimes violate the Rules of Grammar, for variety sake, lest their style should seem too studied and artificial. But S. Paul is so far from designedly diversifying his Discourse with that kind of negligence, that he does not seem to have aimed at so much as the common Ornaments of style. 3. Those defects do seldom occur in the Heathen Authors; whereas S. Paul has abundance of seeming Solæcisms: Thus our Monsieur. But how comes it that in these last words he uses the softer term, viz. Seeming Solæcisms, whereas before he had said plainly S. Paul's Solæcisms? Was he conscious that it would be difficult to make out that S. Paul did abound with real Solæcisms? It is very probable he was, for he could not but be sensible, that it would make against him, if S. Paul abounded only with seeming Solæcisms; whereas he acknowledges that the Heathen Writers are guilty of real ones, do really violate the Rules of Grammar. We may observe also how strangely our Monsieur
Monsieur is prejudiced against the Apostles' style; of which we ought to judge by his Discourses, recorded by S. Luke, as well as by his Epistles. And I would know whether our Monsieur will say that those Discourses, particularly his Defences of himself before Felix and Festus, were destitute of all those things which are commended in a Discourse. Will he say that the Oration, which almost persuaded King Agrippa to be a Christian, had nothing of Rhetoric or Eloquence in it? But that which is most observable is, that our Monsieur would persuade us, that the most elegant Heathen Writers did violate the Rules of Grammar designedly, and that their Solacisms may therefore be looked upon as a particular sort of elegancy; yea, he hath the confidence to make use of Quintilian's authority for the proof of this. Let us (says our Monsieur, p. 399.) hear about this matter Quintilian, l. 9. c. 3. About this matter, i.e. about this matter of Solacisms; and yet Quintilian in that place says nothing of Solacisms, he speaks plainly of Schemes or Figures. Eset omne Schema vitium, &c. He speaks of Solacisms elsewhere, lib. 1. c. 5. clearly distinguishing them from Figures. But let Quintilian distinguish as he pleaseth, here is a greater Critick then he, that says, that in Heathen Wri-
Writers Solœcisms may be look'd upon as so many Figures, but not so in the Apostle of the Gentiles.

P. 619, 620. in 1 John 5.6.

Dr. Hammond does but wrangle with all the most learned Interpreters, who interpret are one of consent. And the reason why they understand these words of consent is, First, because they are so taken in Joh. 19. 13. and 17. 21. Secondly, because here the discourse is about a Unity of Testimony, and not about a Unity of Nature. But why is this consent otherwise express'd in the following Verse? I answer, for variety sake, or also by mere accident. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadver.

Dr. Hammond in 1 John 5.6. Note he had said, that no reason can be assign'd of the different expression, viz. that v.7. it should be said, These three are one; and v.8. These three agree in one, if no more was meant by the former than by the latter; and all that our Monsieur answers to it, is, that it is otherwise express'd for variety sake, or also by mere accident. As if the Penmen of Holy Scripture were not directed by the Spirit
Spirit of God in the writing of it; or as if S. John, treating of so serious and weighty a Subject, did not consider how he should express that which he had to say of it; but it was by meer Accident that he express'd it so or so. Surely they have a very little Veneration for the sacred Scriptures and the Pen-men of them, who utter such things as these. Withall, we may observe how much the Socinians are press'd with this Argument, when to evade it they are forced to invent such ridiculous Answers as these.

Our Monsieur tells us, that Dr. Hammond does but wrangle with all the most learned Interpreters, who interpret are one of consent. But, 1. I would know who are the most learned Interpreters. It may be, in our Monsieur's account, the most learned Interpreters are only the Socinians, and their favourers. 2. Dr. Hammond do's not oppose those who interpret Are one of consent, provided that they do not interpret it of consent only. That the Three which bear witness in Heaven do agree in their Testimony, or testify the same thing, is not question'd by Dr. Hammond, or any other; the only Question is, Whether this be all that is here signified by the words Are one; or whether the words Are one, v. 7. signify no more than the words Agree in one, v. 8. This
This plainly appears from Dr. Hammond's words; and therefore our Monsieur here, as otherwhere, do's but wrangle (or rather trifle) with him.

By this it also appears, that unless the Reasons, which our Monsieur mentions for understanding those words of consent, do prove that they are to be understood of Unity of Testimony, or Consent only, they are not at all to the purpose. He says, that the words are so taken, S. Joh. 10. 30. and 17. 21. In S. Joh. 10. 30. the words are, I and my Father are one; and when our Monsieur can prove that Unity here is no more than Consent; or that the meaning is, that the Father and Son are one only, because they agree in one, they may be to his purpose; but he will never be able to prove that. In S. Joh. 17. 21. it is said, That they may be one; where if it should be granted that Unity signifies Consent, the Speech being of the Apostles, it would not follow that it signifies no more, 1 Joh. 5.7. where the Speech is of the holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. As to the 2d Reason, Because here the discourse is about a Unity of Testimony, and not about a Unity of Nature; our Monsieur herein begs the Question: For tho' S. John speaks only of an Unity of Testimony or Consent, v. 8. where he says,
fays, *These three agree in one*; yet we do not grant that he speaks only of that, v. 7. when he fays, *These three are one:* this our Monsieur should have prov'd, not begg'd.

3. Reflections upon other divinely inspired Persons, P. 224. in Aes. 7.4.

*If this Discourse of S. Stephen were not extant, and the sacred Chronology was taken only out of Moses, every thing in Moses would be plain; for Abraham would be understood to have began his Journey, whilst Terah was alive. But because S. Stephen here says, that Abraham departed from Charan after his Father's death, therefore the Mosaical Chronology is otherwise digested, and Abraham is reckon'd to have gone into Canaan 60 years later. But if we examine the matter more thoroughly, it will seem much more probable that Stephen spake according to the account generally receiv'd in that Age, in which there might have been a mistake, than that he was inspired by the Holy Ghost to speak as he did. — And I suppose that the reason of the mistake in the common account of the Jews, &c. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.*

*Animad.*
The Crimes for which Stephen is thus severely reflected upon by our Monsieur are these. 1. He hath disturb'd and perplex'd the sacred Chronology, which otherwise would have been very plain. 2. He follow'd an erroneous account generally receiv'd by the Jews of that Age; for tho' at first our Monsieur only says that there might be a mistake in it, yet afterward he speaks out, and in plain words calls it a mistake. And after that he had examin'd the matter throughly, our Monsieur determines, that it is much more probable that S. Stephen follow'd this mistake, than that he was inspired by the Holy Ghost to speak as he did. In short, according to our Monsieur, when S. Stephen said that God removed Abraham from Charran, to the land wherein the Jews afterward dwelt when his Father was dead, he was not inspired by the Holy Ghost to say so, but follow'd an erroneous account of the Jews of that Age. Now I would ask our Monsieur, 1. How do's he know that this account was generally receiv'd by the Jews of that Age? Hath he read it in the Writings of some Jewish Doctors that lived then? or hath he met with any other Jewish Authors
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Authors that have told us thus much? I suppose that he will scarce pretend to either of these. Will he say then, that it is the generally-receiv'd Account of later Jewish Writers, whence we may collect that it was commonly receiv'd among the Jews in S. Stephen's time? But I not only deny the Validity of this inference, but withal say, that later Jewish Writers speak so variously and uncertainly of this matter, that it is not easy to know what their opinion is in it. I therefore conclude, that it is impossible for our Monsieur to prove, that it was the generally-receiv'd Account of the Jews of that Age. 2. How appears it that this account is erroneous? Our Monsieur should not have said that S. Stephen is in a mistake, unless he had firm proof of it; but here he does not offer one word of proof. He says indeed that he hath shew'd otherwhere, that Abraham began his journey whilst Terah was alive: But if we will be so kind to him as to allow that he hath shew'd it; it will not follow still that Stephen was in an error, as Petavius de Doctr. Temp. l.9. c.18. Lud. de Dieu in Act. 7. 4. Strauchiæ in Breviar. Chronol. l.4. c. 5. quaest. 5. and more especially our Mr. Cartwright in Gen. 12. 4. with many others have shew'd.
P. 48. in S. Matth. 13. 21.

The Exposition of this Parable is full of Impropieties of Speech; Thus Monsieur Le Clerc,

Animadv.

Our Monsieur upbraids Dr. Hammond so often with Impropieties of Speech, that it is become habitual to him; and he must throw this Stone at those that come in his way, not mattering who they be. The Exposition of the Parable of the Sower, according to our Monsieur, not only hath some Impropieties of Speech, but is full of them; Yet he instances only in one, viz. in vers. 19. When any one (says Christ) heareth the word of the Kingdom, and understandeth it not, the wicked one cometh and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart: this is he which was sowed by the way-side; Thus our Monsieur. And his meaning is, that in these last words, This is he which was sowed by the way-side, there is an Impropiety of Speech. But is he sure, that the words which our Savi, our used, did in the language in which he spake, signify the very same which these words do in our language? Or is he sure, that
that the words which S. Matthew used (who is said to have writ in Hebrew) did signify the very same? Yea I ask once more, is he sure, that the Greek words which we have in our Bibles do signify the very same that his English ones do? If they do not, then the impropriety of speech is his own, neither our Saviour’s, nor S. Matthew’s, nor S. Matthew’s Translators, i.e. the persons that translated S. Matthew’s Gospel into Greek. In short, there is no necessity of rendering the Greek so as our Monsieur renders it. Dr. Hammond might have taught him this, if he had not disclaimed to learn of one whom he so much vilifies. He in his Margin renders it thus, This is it which is sown by the path’s side. And if he had consulted the Latin Interpretations of the Syriack and Arabick Versions, he would have found that they agree with Dr. Hammond. Hoc est quod juxta viam sementur, and the Latin Interpretation of the Persian Version agrees with them. This, i.e. this word of the Kingdom which is heard, but not understood (as it is in the former part of the Verse) is it which is sown by the path’s side. I add, that our English Translation is not to be condemned. This is he which received seed by the ways-side; especially when Beza, Schmidtus and others render the words af- ter
ter the same manner. To these I shall add Vatablus his rendering, viz. This is the seed which was sown by the ways-side. Every one sees that there is no impropriety of speech in any of these Translations; and if the words do very well admit of any of them, it is manifest that there is no necessity of rendering them as our Monsieur doth, and consequently the impropriety of speech is his own, and neither our Saviour's, nor S. Matthew's, nor yet that Apostolical person's (whosoever he was) that Translated the Gospel of S. Matthew into Greek.

Sect. II.

Of Monsieur Le Clerc's Reflections upon the Ancient Fathers.

In the former Section we have taken notice of our Monsieur's Reflections upon our Saviour and his Apostles; it will not be amis here to take a view of his dealing with the Primitive Fathers of the Church; for it is not to be expected that they should be above their Lord and Master, having treated him so rudely, it cannot seem strange if our Monsieur reflect
fleck much more severely upon them. I shall instance in *Justin Martyr*, Tertullian, and S. Austin.

1. Reflections upon *Justin Martyr*, P. 496, 497. in 2 Thes. 2. 4.

Our learned Author here pays a greater deference to the Authority of Justin Martyr than he need; for why might not he be mistaken in this, who erred in so many other things? Did not the same Man make Herod to be Contemporary with Ptolomæus Philadelphus and the Septuagint? Did not he say that the word Satanæs was compounded of Sata and nas, tho’ he was disputing with a Jew, who could easily refute such a mistake? Did not he very unjustly and falsely, and yet with no small confidence, accuse the Jews of corrupting the Holy Scriptures? And could not he who erred so grossly in these things, not to mention any more, rashly take an occasion from the Inscription of a Statue which he misunderstood, to say what was not true? He was a Martyr, what then? Are Martyrs infallible, or to be believed when they are manifestly mistaken? And if they have been deceived in some easy things, and are not to be credited in all, why might not they be mistaken in matters of greater difficulty? —
And who can doubt, if there was ever any Tripho Judæus in the World, that should have read his Dialogue, or any other Jew whatsoever, but he would have scorned, and that justly, what Justin upbraids the Jews with, as to the corruption of the Sacred Writings, which in a modern Author would be call'd a Calumny. The bare Authority then of Justin is not to be regarded; Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

Here our Monsieur was in such a Transport of Passion against Justin Martyr, that he could not but express his displeasure against Dr. Hammond, because (as he pretends') he paid a greater deference to his Authority than he needed, and yet the time was when this Justin Martyr was a very Authentick Writer in his account. For p. 161, he makes use of his Authority in a matter of very great moment, telling us, that when a child he might perhaps have seen the Apostle S. John, and that he presented to the Emperour Antoninus Pius an Apology for the Christians, &c. May not the same be said of him that he says of Dr. Hammond, that he pays too great a deference to the Authority of Justin, when he produces it in a matter of so great importance?
portance? May not the Arguments which
he useth against Dr. Hammond be turned
against him?

But let us examine that which our Mon-
sieur says here to persuade us, that an Au-
thority, which was good enough before, is
not to be regarded. He grants that Justin
was a Martyr; but (says he) What then?
Are Martyrs infallible, or to be believed when
they are manifestly mistaken? To which I
say, 1. It is true that they are not to be
believed when they are manifestly mista-
ken, but it is no less true that they may
be safely believed when our Monsieur says
that they are manifestly mistaken. For he
is not infallible any more than they were,
but may be mistaken himself, when he says
that others are. 2. Tho' the Martyrs were
not infallible, they were Men of extraor-
dinary Sanctity, and therefore we may
justly presume that God gave them a more
than ordinary measure of his Spirit to in-
lighten their understandings to discern the
truth, and to preserve them from errors
or mistakes.

But (says our Monsieur) Justin Martyr
erred in many other things, and why might
he not be mistaken in this? And I ask on
the other hand, Will he then affirm that
he that errs in some things, must be be-
lieved in none? Our Monsieur himself
errs
errs in many things, and yet I believe he would not take it well if he saw that he was not believed in any; especially if he had been an eye-witness of that which he relates, as perhaps Justin Martyr had been an eye-witness of that which Dr. Hammond hath transcrib’d out of his Apology. Besides if Justin, because of the mistakes which our Monsieur pretends to discover in him, is not to be credited in any thing, why doth he himself allege him, and that in a matter of great moment, as hath been lately observ’d?

But what are the Errors which this Primitive Martyr is charged with? Our Monsieur mentions three; The first is, that he (i.e. Justin) makes Herod to be contemporary with Ptolemeus Philadelphus and the Septuagint. And I must acknowledge, that if the Martyr did make Herod, the Father of Archelaus, contemporary to them, I cannot acquit him from a very great error in Chronology. But how appears it that he did? Are we sure that there was no fault in the Transcribers of his Apology, that some ignorant Transcriber did not add the name Herod, when Justin Martyr had only said that Ptolemeus wrote to him who had the chief Rale at that time among the Jews, and that the chief Ruler sought the Books? Or are we sure that some
some Transcriber did not substitute Herod for some other word? There are who think that Justin had writ ἰερεὺς (for the chief Priest had the Rule at that time) and some Transcriber not knowing what to make of it (because he thought it must be the Name of him that bore Rule,) and not remem-bring any Ruler of that Name, writ ἤρωδην instead of it; and a little after βασιλεὺς ἤρωδης instead of βασιλεὺς ἰερεὺς. Certainly every one that is not strangely prejudiced against the Martyr (as our Monsieur shews himself to be,) will rather admit of either of these, than think that so learned a Man as Justin, who lived so near to Herod's time, that he writ this Apology within 150 years after his death, was so ignorant as not to know that Herod, the Father of Archelaus, was long after the time of Ptolemaus Philadelphus.

The second Error which our Monsieur charges Justin Martyr with, is his saying, that the word Satanæs is compounded of Sata and nas. To which I say, that Justin speaking of the name Satanæs, says, that it is as it were made up of two words, which denote the things which he did, viz. Sata and nas, the former of which (says he) signifies an Apostate or Defeter, the latter a Serpent; and so Satanæs may denote both his Apostasy from God and
his tempting Men, as the Serpent tempted Eve at the first. Thus the Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho. And I do not see that this can be look'd upon as so great an error, since here he only occasionally makes this Observation upon the name Satan, and it do's no way appear that he design'd to give the Etymology of it.

The third Error charged upon this Father is his accusing the Jews of corrupting the Holy Scriptures, which (says our Monsieur) he doth very unjustly and falsely; adding afterward, that if any Jew had read his Dialogue, he would have scorn'd, and that justly, what Justin upbraids the Jews with as to the corrupting of the Sacred Writings. Thus our Monsieur. Now this is very high, that an holy and ancient Martyr should be charged to be a very unjust and false Accuser, and that he should be told that the Jews would have scorn'd, and that justly, that which they are upbraided with as to the corrupting the Sacred Writings: and yet our Monsieur hath the Vanity to expect that we should believe all this upon his bare word. He should have proved, 1. That Justin Martyr accuses the Jews of corrupting the Hebrew Text of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. 2. That, if he do's, he accuses them falsely.
I say that our Monsieur ought to have proved that Justin accuses the Jews of corrupting the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, for I make account that they who do not corrupt the Original Text of the Scripture, cannot properly be said to corrupt the Scripture. There are some who deny this, viz. that Justin accuses the Jews of corrupting the Hebrew Text, particularly Du Pin in his History of the Canon of Scripture, 1. 1. c. 4. f. 4. I shall transcribe his words, Justin Martyr (says he) do's not say any where that the Jews changed or corrupted the Hebrew Text, but only that they made unfaithful Translations of it, and such as differ'd from those of the Septuagint; and that they had cut off from that Version some places where there were Prophecies of Jesus Christ. Vos autem, &c. But you have dared to corrupt the Translations of your Elders; which they made by the Order of the King of Egypt, alleging that the Scripture has it not as they translated it. They endeavour to translate them otherwise; And have likewise taken away several whole passages out of the Edition of the 70 Elders, which manifestly foretold this crucified Jesus to be God and Man, and that he died on the Cross. For instance he alleges Matt. 7. 14, which they translated, Behold a young Woman shall conceive; whereas the LXX translated...
translated it, Behold a Virgin shall conceive. Thus Du Pin. I add, that I do not find that S. Justin hath this expression of corrupting the Holy Scriptures; but if the changing some words in the Copies of the LXX, (as the putting νεκρός instead of παρθένος, Isa. 7. 14.) or the expunging and taking away some passages which were found in the Copies of the LXX, which Justin took to be the truest, be that which our Monsieur calls the corrupting the Holy Scripture, I shall not deny that the Martyr upbraids the Jews with these; perhaps also he upbraids them with misinterpreting some places of the Old Testament; but that he accuseth them of corrupting the Hebrew Text itself by changing the words, or by adding to and taking from it, our Monsieur will not be able to prove.

2. Our Monsieur ought to have proved, that if any do accuse the Jews of corrupting the Holy Scripture, the Accusation is unjust and false. For they, who labour to vindicate the Jews as to this particular, have not put the matter so perfectly out of doubt, but there are some still who do suspect that they have not been so clear as to this matter, as our Monsieur would make them to be. It is well known that some late have very stiffly and earnestly maintained the Truth and Justice of this Charge.
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which he doth with the greatest confidence accuse of Injustice and Falshood. Also the Testimonies of many of the Ancients are alledged who accuse the Jews of corrupting the Holy Scriptures. I know that Du Pin (ubi supra) takes no small pains to invalidate these Testimonies, and perhaps some of them are not so clear and full to the purpose; but I conceive that it may be truly said of others of them, that it will not be an easy matter to evade them. I shall instance in S. Hierome in Galat. 3. Upon those words, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things, &c. v. 10. he saith thus, Incertum habemus, utrum LXX Interpretates addiderint Omnis homo & In omnibus, an in veteri Hebraico ita fuerit, & postea à Judaeis deletum sit. In hanc me autem suspicione illa res stimulat, quod Verbum Omnis & In omnibus quasi sensui suo necessarium ad probandum illud quod quicunque ex operibus Legis sunt sub maledicto sint, Apostolus vir Hebrae peritia & in Lege doceissimus nunquam pro tulisset, nisi in Hebrais voluminiis habere tur. Quam olaus Samaritanorum Hebrae volumina relegens invenit quod interpretatur Omnis & Omnibus scriptum esse, & cum LXX Interpretibus concordare. Frustra igitur illud tulerunt Judaei. These are S. Hierome's words, so plain and full, that
that I did admire that Du Pin should attempt to evade them, but much more when I saw how little he had to offer in answer to them. He says, 1. That when he (i.e. S. Hierome) says that the Jews cut off the Particle Col in vain, he only speaks it as the opinion of those who pretended the Jews had cut it off. To which I answer, that this is a mere fiction, not having any foundation at all in S. Hierome's words, as is manifest to every one. Besides, if it was not his opinion that they cut them off, why do's he trouble himself to give us the reason why they did it? which he doth in the words following those which I have transcrib'd, Ne viderentur esse sub maledicto, si non possent omnia compleere quae scripta sunt. 2. Du Pin says that S. Hierome acknowledges it to be very uncertain. To which I say, that at first this Father was not satisfied, whether the LXX had added the Particle Col, or the Jews had razed it out; but afterward when he consulted the Samaritan Pentateuch, and found the word Col there, he became satisfied that it was not added by the LXX, but that the Jews expunged it. This is plain from the Father's words, for after he had told us that he had consulted a Samaritan Copy, he says positively, Illudsulerunt Judei. 3. Du Pin adds, that the reason why he believed they
might have been in the Hebrew, in because there is no probability that the Apostle would have quoted those words so, if they had not been in the Hebrew Copies; and in effect the Particle Col is found in the Samaritan Text. It's this that made him say, that it was in vain for the Jews to have cut them off, since the Copies written in more ancient Characters testify that they were there. As is a mere conjecture founded on the Conformity of the Samaritan Text with the Septuagint: Thus Du Pin. But there that learned Author doth only confute himself. He had said before that S. Hierome spake it only as the opinion of others, here he says, that he spake it as his own belief. The reason (says he) why he believed. Again in the last words he says, that it is a mere conjecture founded on the Conformity of the Samaritan Text with the LXX, but before he had made it to be the Father's belief, founded not only upon the Samaritan Copies, but also upon this, that it is not probable, that the Apostle would have quoted the Words so, if they had not been in the Hebrew Copies. Thus I have examin'd that little which Du Pin says to invalidate S. Hierome's Testimony in his Commentary on Gal. 3. 10. In his Commentary on the same Chapter, v. 13, there is a passage to the same purpose: The Ed-
other's words are these, Mihi videtur aut veteres Hebreorum libros aliter habuisse quam nunc habent, aut Apostolum sensum Scripturarum posuisse non verba, aut, quod magis est estimandum, post passionem Christi & in Hebreis & in nostris codicibus ubi aliquo Dei nomen apposatum, ut infantiam nostri incriminareret, qui in Christum maledictum à Deo credimus. Du Pin do's not deny that by them, who to fix a brand of infamy upon us, added יָּאָשׁ to the Text, S. Hierome meant the Jews. What then do's he say to this Testimony? He says that the Father brings the different Versions of the Hebrew Text, and the different Senses that may be given to it. He adds, that the Father examines why the Apostle hath left out those words Of God, which are both in the Hebrew Text and in the LXX, and hath added other words which are in the LXX, but not in the Hebrew. Lasty, he sets down S. Hierome's words. Now how all this can be any Answer to S. Hierome's Testimony, or take off the force of it, I know not; from the words, Quod magis est estimandum, it seems to be plain, that it was his opinion that the Jews had added יָּאָשׁ to the Hebrew Text to reproach us. There are also Testimonies alleged out of many other Fathers, of which I might have taken notice, and shew'd that
Du Pin in vain labours to invalidate some of them; but I have singled out S. Hierome, because he is look'd upon as a great friend to the Hebrew Text and the Authenticity of it. To make an end as to this, since many learned Writers, both ancient and modern, have suspected that the Jews were guilty of tampering with and corrupting the Scriptures, our Monsieur ought not to have taken the contrary for granted, but he should have given us some solid proof of it, before he had fallen so foul upon those whom he suppos'd to be of a different opinion from him.

These things I thought fit to offer in defence of that pious Martyr and holy Father of the Church S. Justin; but after all, let it be suppos'd that he was mistaken in a matter of Chronology, or in the Etymology of a word, or in his opinion of the Jews, are these such gross errors, as that because of them he must not be believed in any thing, but be rail'd at, and Dr. Hammond must not be allow'd to pay so much reverence to him as to make use of his Testimony in any matter, tho' our Monsieur has a privilege that he may alledge him, and must not be censured for it?
Besides, this Inscription, if it be understood of Simon Magus, is contrary both to the Use of the Latin Tongue and the Custom of the Romans, nor is it at all countenanced by the History of that Age. In Latin there is none so call'd absolutely Deus Sanctus, besides Semon or Simon (if we chuse so to write it, tho' corruptly) an unknown God of the Sabins, or Hercules, as Lilius Giraldus will inform us in Hist. Deorum. And it was not the Custom of the Romans to erect Statues to private Men, and that before their death, such as Simon the Samaritan, as to Gods: nor can any one instance to that purpose be produced out of all the Roman History. And if so usual a thing had been done by Claudius, whose folly so many Writers have recorded, there would be some mention made of it by the Heathens, whereas there is not the least mark or sign of it any where to be found. But (says our Author) if Justin had been mistaken, or wrote what he knew to be false, the Emperours to whom he wrote would easily have discover'd the Cheat. But the Emperours perhaps did not so much as look into the Apologeticks of Justin; it may be, which was their ignorance or wickedness, they laughed...
laughed at them, and despised every thing else that was good in them because of this error. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Dr. Hammond in 2 Thess. note g, hath these words, Justin Martyr affirms that Claudius erected him (i. e. Simon Magus) a Statue at Rome on Tiber, between the two Bridges, inscribed Simoni Deo Saneto. And although Petrus Ciconius in Opusc. suspects this to be a mistake in Justin, because in that place at Rome, An Dom. 1574, the basis of a Marble was digged up with this Inscription Simoni Sango Deo Fidio carum, &c., yet the Authority of Justin, writing this so soon after to the Emperours of Rome, who could and would have discerned his falsity if it had been such, will be abundantly sufficient to oppose to this conjecture; especially when Irenæus, insisting on it soon after him, and Terrullian better acquainted with that City and Story than to be thus imposed upon, have added their confirmations of it. Thus Dr. Hammond. And this is the passage in which (as our Monsieur would persuade us) he pays too great a deference to the Authority of Justin. Our Monsieur thinks that the Father was mistaken in that which he relates concerning a Sta-
a Statue erected to Simon Magus, and some before him have inclin'd to that opinion. But Dr. Hammond gives his Reasons why he could not subscribe to their Conjecture, which stand in full force notwithstanding any thing which our Monsieur doth offer in answer to them.

He makes Dr. Hammond to argue thus, If Justin was mistaken, or wrote what he knew to be false, the Emperours to whom he wrote would easily have discover'd the cheat. But this is not Dr. Hammond's Argument. 1. He hath not these words, If Justin wrote what he knew to be false. He could not imagine that any one would have the confidence to charge the Holy Martyr with this. But our Monsieur has a privilege to make his Adversary to say any thing which he thinkes may expose him, as he here makes Dr. Hammond to say that which never enter'd into his thoughts.

2. Dr. Hammond's Argument is taken from Justin's writing this concerning the Statue to the Emperour, which he durst not have done, if he had not been fully assur'd of the truth of it. Writing an Apology to the Emperour, in all probability he would use the means that it might have the desired effect; and this would oblige him to the greatest care, that there might be nothing false in it, because he might be assur'd that
that the falsity (if there was any) would be discovered by the Emperor, or those that were about him. It had been a strange imprudence in Justin; if in an Apology to the Emperor of Rome he had mention'd a thing as done there, and that publickly by one of his Predecessors, and not had some assurance that it was true. And it is no less strange that any can think that he could have the confidence to do it. We now see what Dr. Hammond's Argument was; of which our Monsieur would take no notice, but substitutes another instead of it, which he thought himself bettet atab to grapple with. And yet to this Argument of his own framing, he returns nothing in answer, but perhaps, and it may be, the Emperors (says he) perhaps did not as much as look into his Apologises; and it may be they laugh'd at them, and despis'd all the rest that was good in them because of this error; i.e. Perhaps they never look'd into them, perhaps they did, perhaps they despis'd and laugh'd at them, perhaps they did not. Thus satisfactorily does our Monsieur answer his own Argument. As to Dr. Hammond, it is not material whether the Emperor look'd into the Apologetical no; it is enough that Justin could not be secure that he would not look into it, and to discover the falsi-
ties that were in it, if there were any. And because he could not, it concern'd him to be very circumspect and careful that there should be none, he could not have either so little prudence, or so great confidence, as to write that to the Emperour, of the truth of which he had not a competent assurance.

As Dr. Hammond did not rely upon Justin Martyr's Authority as barely considered, but as he writ to the Emperour of a matter of fact, the truth or fallhood, of which he could more easily discover than any other; so he backs his Authority with that of two other ancient Writers, Irenæus and Tertullian. To Irenæus our Monsieur answers, that he premises before this story the word dicitur, it is said, which shews that he was not confident of the truth of it, but only declar'd what some others reported. To which I say, 1. If some others (in the Plural Number) reported it, then S. Justin was not the only reporter of it. 2. Our Monsieur too hastily concludes from that word dicitur, that Irenæus was not confident of the truth of this, that Claudius erected a Statue to the honour of Seso. The word Dicitur shews indeed that Irenæus was not an eye-witness of Claudius's doing this, he lived many years after the Reign of Claudius, and so must have it
it by the report of others, who had given an account of Simon's coming to Rome at that time, and his reception there; but this is all that can be certainly infer'd from it.

3. If Irenæus had not been confident of the truth of it, we may believe that he would not have mention'd it. That which our Monsieur hath to say to Tertullian I shall transcribe and examine very shortly.

As our Monsieur offers something by way of Answer to that which Dr. Hammond alleges in defence of the Truth of Justin Martyr's Relation, so he produces some Arguments whereby he thinks quite to baffle and overthrow it. He says, that in Latin none is call'd absolutely Deus Sanctus, besides Simon or Simon an unknown God of the Sabins or Hercules, and that it was not the Custom of the Romans to erect Statues to private Men, and that before their death, as unto Gods. To which I answer, If Simon a God of the Sabins was call'd Deus Sanctus, as our Monsieur says he was, why might not Simon Magnus be call'd so too, who by the strange things which he effected by the power of Magicke, had so amus'd the People of Rome, that they believ'd him to be a God? as before them the Samaritans from the least to the greatest were so deluded by him, that they cry'd him up to be the great Power of God, Acts 8. 10.
8. No. And tho' we should suppose it to be true which our Monsieur says, that it was not the custom of the Romans to give this appellation of Deus Sacerdus, or to erect Statues to private Men as to Gods; yet in this extraordinary Case of one who did such wonderful things, that they believed him to be really a God, they might do it. We may believe that it was not the custom of the Lycurgians to sacrifice to private Men, yet seeing a great Miracle wrought by Paul and Barnabas, and thereupon taking them to be Gods, they were hardly restrained from offering sacrifice to them, Act. 14.

Our Monsieur argues also from the silence of Heathen Writers, no mention of this Statue being found in them. But everyone knows of how little force this Argument is. If this way of arguing be valid, we may deny that Herod murdered the Innocents, because of the silence of Josephus and other Jewish Historians, as to that most barbarous Cruelty of his. How little should we believe of the Ecclesiastical History of the three first Centuries, if the silence of Heathen Historians must be own'd to be a sufficient Argument against it? Our Monsieur says this:— that the two first Martyrs, Peter and John, were martyred in the Reign of Nero. And
and yet I believe it will not be very easy for him to allege any Heathen Historian who attests this. Once more, perhaps you will find little mention of Simon Magnus in Heathen Histories, shall we upon that account deny that there was such a person as this Simon? And yet such as these are the Arguments which our Monsieur opposes to the Relation of Irenæus, l. i. c. 20, Tertullian Apolog. c. 13. Cyrill. Hieras. Catech. 6. Theodoret. Heretic. Fabul. l. i. &c. as well as of Justin Martyr, who mentions the Statue twice in the same Apology, viz. that which is commonly call'd his second.

2. Reflections upon Tertullian, P. 497. in 2 Thess. 2. 4.

Tertullian, as those Apologetick Writers, used to do, did but transcribe those that went before him, never minding or examining whether what they said was true. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad.

Dr. Hammond produces the Testimonies of two very ancient Writers, Irenæus and Tertullian, to confirm the Truth of that which Justin had transmitted to Posterity,
concerning a Statue erected to Simon Magus; the former of which Irenæus wholly escapes our Monsieur's lash, but the latter is most barbarously treated as we see. If any ask the reason of this partiality, it is no other then this. Irenæus had been so favourable to him as to add the word Dicitur, which enabled him to say something which might look like an Answer; but Tertullian says positively, Simonem Magnum statua & inscriptione Saneti Dei inauguratis: Which words being so plain, that they do not admit of any Answer; he saw that there was no way but to disparage his Testimony as much as he could. And therefore he lets loose the reins of his displeasure against him, and would persuade us, that he only Transcribes that which others had said before him, and minded not whether that which they said was true; Whether it was true or false which he writ, Tertullian did not concern himself. Tertullian being so much at Rome, could not want opportunities for examining the Truth of the Relation; but, according to our Monsieur, he was so wretchedly careless and negligent, that he would not be at the pains to examine and satisfy himself about it. In like manner, p. 494. he says of Justin Martyr, that he wrote whatsoever he heard without making any difference. Yea, so great is his displea-
displeasure against Tertullian, that for his sake he falls foul upon the rest of the Apologetick Writers, laying the same of them, viz. that they used only to Transcribe that which had been said by those that went before them, never minding or examining whether what they said was true. So that Justin Martyr and Tertullian, and the rest of the Apologizers were, in our Monsieur’s account, a company of lazy fellows, that took every thing upon Trust, and did not trouble themselves to enquire whether it was true or false. Thus shamefully doth he treat those excellent persons, who have obliged the World so much by their most learned and elaborate Defences of the only true, i.e. the Christian Religion.

3. Reflections upon S. Austin,

_Pag. 139._ in _S. Luk. 14. 23._

This Passage alone is enough to shew us of what advantage Grammar, or, if you please, Criticism, is to the right interpretation of Scripture, seeing S. Austin, who was otherwise a very ingenious Man, but an absolute stranger to this sort of Learning, did so wretchedly force and misinterpret this Passage, and make use of it to defend the most cruel Opinion imaginable. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

_Animadv._
Animad

The storm of our Monsieur's displeasure falls most severely upon S. Austin, whom he owns to have been a very ingenious Man, but makes him a perfect stranger to Grammar and Criticism. This sort of Learning is peculiar to our Monsieur; Dr. Hammond knew very little of it, and S. Austin nothing at all. If he had only said that S. Austin was not the greatest Critick and Grammarian in the World, it might have seemed tolerable; but to say that he was a perfect stranger to Grammar and Criticism, is that which cannot be reconciled either with Truth or Modesty. What our Monsieur understands by Criticism, I know not; but (if I mistake not) true Criticism is nothing else but a faculty of judging a right of things, or a good and sound Judgment. He that can judge of things best, is the best Critick. Now I believe there are few that will say that S. Austin was a Man of no Judgment in Matters of Religion; and if any shall say that he was of a sounder Judgment in many things than our Monsieur is, and consequently a better Critick, I think few serious Men will deny it.

But our Monsieur in his Letter before his Supplement, p. 18. goes still higher. His Words
Words are these, *I should say that either he had no knowledge at all of the Holy Scriptures, or a great deal of impudence, who should attribute to S. Austin a critical Skill, and that in the Scriptures.* But it is certain that a great part of the Divines that have lived since S. Austin’s time, have follow’d his Judgment in many things, and paid a great deference to it, and consequently attributed to him a Skill of judging in Matters of Religion; and how dares our Monsieur say that all these had no knowledge at all of the Holy Scriptures? If he dares, I must needs say that he wants not a large share of confidence.

**Monsieur Le Clerc’s Letter before his Supplement, Pag. 17, 18.**

*I said that irresistible Grace, which is asserted by S. Austin, did not seem to me to be agreeable to Scripture.—In this matter S. Austin neither thought piously, nor wrote learnedly of God. And as little Piety, or Learning, do’s he shew in his Epistles to Boniface and Vincentius; where he zealously defends Persecution on the account of Religion, and that with very absurd Arguments. He was one of the first that promoted some two Doctrines, which take away all Goodness and Justice both from God and Men. For by*
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the one God is represented as creating the
greatest part of Mankind to damn them, and
sentence them to eternal Torments for sins
committed by another, or which they them-
selves could not avoid; and by the other Ma-
gistrates, and all that have the Administra-
tion of publick Affairs, are stirred up to per-
secute those that differ'd from them in Mat-
ters of Religion. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadw.

Here our Monsieur charges three Er-
rours upon S. Austin, and falls very foul
upon him for every one of them. The first
is that Father's asserting irresistible Grace,
in doing which (according to our Mon-
sieur) he neither thought piously of God,
nor wrote learnedly of him. But why do's
he not allude S. Austin's words, or direct
us to the places where he asserts this? Per-
haps these words Irresistible Grace, are not
to be found in all the Works of that Father.
I grant that he says, that the Will of Man
cannot resist the Will of God, Non est du-
hitandum voluntati Dei humanas voluntates
non possi resistere, quan minus faciat ille quod
vult L. de Correctione & Gratia, c. 14. In
the same Chapter he says, that when God
will save a Man, no Will of Man do's re-
sist him; Volenti salvum facere nullum ha-

E 3

minum
minum resistat arbitrium. Likewise L. de prædestinatione Sanct. c. 8. he says, Hæc gratia, quæ occulte humanis cordibus Divina largitate tribuitur, à nullo duro corde respuitur. This Grace is refus'd by no hard heart. The Act of Resisting is taken away, no hard heart do's refuse or resist it; it is apply'd to the person under such circumstances, in such fort, and at such a time, as that it is not resisted; whereas if it had been apply'd in another manner, and at another time, it might possibly have been resisted. So that I do not find that this Father says, that the power of Resisting is taken away, tho' he affirms that the Act is. And that this is all S. Austin's meaning, may appear from hence, that he constantly urges that this Grace doth not destroy Free-will. Thus Epist. 107. Ita fit (says he) ut neque fideles sint nisi libero arbitrio, & tamen illius gratia fideles sint, qui eorum à potestate tenebrarum liberavit arbitrium. Also in the same Epistle, Quomodo dicitur negare liberum voluntatis arbitrium, qui confitetur omnem hominem, qui suo corde credit in Deum, nonnisi sua libera credere voluntate. So Epist. 47. Fides sana Catholica non negat liberum arbitrium, sive in vitam malam, sive in bonam; and Epist. 46. Obedientia nulla potest esse sine libero arbitrio. In this 46th Epistle we have also that celebrated Saying of his, Si
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non est Dei Gratia, quomodo salvat mundum? & si non est liberum arbitrium, quomodo judicat mundum? To which agrees that which he says, L. 2. de libero arbitrio c. i. Illud bonum, quo commendatur ipsa justitia in damnandis peccatis & recte fatis honorandis, quomodo esset, si homo cararet libero voluntatis arbitrio? Hence it is that L. 2. de peccat. mer. & remiss. c. 5. he says, Non sicut in lapidibus, aut sicut in eis in quorum natura rationem voluntatemque non condidit, salutem nostram Deus operatur in nobis. Much more might be alleged to this purpose. Now when S. Austin writ these things, I cannot think that he deserved so severe a Censure as this of our Monsieur's, that he neither thought piously of God, nor writ learnedly of him. I shall only add, that it is no easy matter to reconcile this which he writes of Free-will with irresistible Grace.

The second Error charged upon S. Austin by our Monsieur, is a doctrine by which God is represented as creating the greatest part of Mankind to damn them to eternal Torments, for sins committed by another, or which they themselves cannot avoid. But why do's not our Monsieur tell us what this blamphemous Doctrine is, this Doctrine which takes away all Goodness and Justice
from God? This certainly he ought to have done; for so long as we know not what it is, we cannot judge either whether S. Austin really taught such Doctrine, or whether God is so strangely misrepresented by it or not. Do's that Father say in express words, that God created the greatest part of Men to damn them to eternal Torments for the sins of another, or such as they could not avoid? If he do's, his words should have been produced, or at least we should have been directed where to find them. If he do's not, all that can be said in our Monsieur's behalf is, that it is a Consequence from something which S. Austin taught. But, if I mistake not, the Rule is, that persons should not be charged with all the Consequences of their Doctrine, nor indeed with any but such as are so manifest, that they themselves could not but see that they did necessarily and unavoidably follow upon it. But tho' this is sufficient as to our Monsieur, I think it may not be amiss to offer something for the clearing the Father from this imputation.

1. If, according to S. Austin, God Wills that all Men should be saved, then he did not create the greatest part of Men to damn them. Now that it may appear, that, according to S. Austin, God Wills that all Men
Men should be saved, I shall produce two remarkable Testimonies, waving the rest which might be allledged. *Vult Deus omnes homines salvos fieri, & in agnitionem veritatis venire, non sic tamen ut eis adimatur liberum arbitrium, quo vel bene vel male utentes justissime judicentur:* Thus S. Aust. I. de Spiritu & litera, c. 33. And in Serm. 38. de Sanetis Auditiur sunt impii Discendite à me maledicti in ignem aeternum. Inevitabilis enim sententia est quæ à piaissimo Deo ideo multo ante prædictur, ut à nobis totis viribus caveatur. Si enim nos Deus nofter vellet punire, non nos ante tota secula commovere. Invitus quodammodo vindicat, qui quomodo evadere possimus multo ante demonstrat. Non enim te vult punire, qui tibi clamat Observa.

2. If, according to S. Austin, God will condemn Men for their own sins, which they by their Free-will have committed, then, according to him, God did not create the greatest part of Mankind to damn them for the sins of another, or for the sins which they could not avoid. That, according to this Father, God will condemn Men for their own sins, which they by their Free-will have committed, is evident from the words lately allledged out of his L. de Spiritu & litera, c. 33. *Non sic tamen ut eis adimatur liberum arbitrium quo vel bene vel male*
male utentes justissime judicentur. So in Actis cum Felice, l. 2. c. 8. Non est ergo indignum ut Deus dicat, Ite in ignem aeternum eis, qui ejus misericordiam per liberum arbitrium respuerunt. So likewise Epist. 46. Si non est liberum arbitrium, quomodo judicabit mundum? We see then that the sins for which God will judge and condemn Men at the Great Day, according to S. Austin, are their own, and committed by their own Free-will and Choice; not anothers, or such as they could not avoid.

3. S. Austin in Respons. ad articulos sibi falsae impostos, plainly and expressly disowns this Doctrine which our Monsieur charges him with, and teaches the contrary. The second Article falsely impos'd upon him, is, that Deus nolit omnes salvare, etiam omnes salvari velit. In opposition to it S. Austin says, Sincerissime credendum est atque profitendum, Deum velle ut omnes homines salvi sint. The third Article falsely impos'd upon him is, that Deus majorem partem generis humani ad hoc creat ut illam perdat in aeternum: To which S. Austin answers thus, Omnium quidem hominum Deus Creator est, sed nemo ab eoideo creatus est ut pereat. This is sufficient to shew how injurious our Monsieur is to the Holy Father in charging this Doctrine upon him.
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A third Doctrine still remains. Our Monsieur says, that S. Austin zealously defends Persecution on the account of Religion, and that with very absurd Arguments; and that Magistrates, and all that have the Administration of publick Affairs, are stirred up by his Doctrine to persecute those that differ from them in Matters of Religion; and for this he refers us to his Epistles to Boniface and Vincentius. But when our Monsieur says, To persecute those that differ from them, he misrepresents S. Austin, who speaks not of those that differ from us, but of Hereticks and Schismaticks; whereas every one that differs from us in Matters of Religion is not a Schismatick or Heretick. Add hereto, that S. Austin and his Collegues had to do at this time peculiarly with the Donatists, who themselves had been most barbarously cruel to the Catholicks; and if for such Cruelties the Emperours thought it necessary to enact Laws against them, it was not only for a difference in Matters of Religion. Illi sic exarserunt, & tantis sunt odiorum stimulis incitati, ut contra eorum insidias atque violentias & apertissima latrocinia vix ulle nostra communiois Ecclesiæ possent esse secura, vix ulle via tuta qua iter agerent quicunque adversus eorum rabiem pacem Catholicam praedicarent: Thus S. Austin Epist. 50. ad Bonifacium. A little before
Animadversions upon

Before he says, Eorum laborat furor, aut
nos occidere ut sua crudelitatis pascant libi-
dinem, aut etiam seipsum, ne perdidisse vi-
deantur occidendorum hominum potestatem.
And again, speaking of those who dwelt
among them, Si unum verbum (says he)
pro Catholica discerent, & ipsi & domus eor-
um funditus everterentur. Whereupon he
concludes, Quis est tam demens qui neget
istis debuisse per iussa Imperialia subveniri,
ut de tanto eruerentur malo? And after-
wards, Cum bis angustiis affigeretur Eccle-
sea, quisquis existimat omnia potius sueti-
nenda, quam Dei auxilium ut per Christi-
anos Imperatores ferretur suisse poscendum,
parum attendit non bonam de hab negoti-
tia reddi putuisse rationem. Further still,
S. Austin was so far from stirring up the
Emperors to enact severe Laws against
them, that he and his Colleges endeav-
our'd that there might be a mitigation of
them, and to that end they sent some cho-
sen persons, but they came too late; for
the Emperor had been inform'd of the
Rage and Cruelty of the Donatists, and
particularly of their most barbarous Usage
of one Maximian a Catholick Bishop. An-
tequam iste leges, quibus ad convivium san-
etum coguntur intrare, in Africanum mitteren-
tur, nonnullis fratibus videbatur, in quib-
bus & ego eram, quamvis Donatistarum ra-
bies.
bien usquequeaque saeiret, non esse petendum
ab Imperatoribus ut ipsum Haresim jubere
omnino non esse, paenam constituendo eis qui
in illa esse voluissent; sed hoc potius consi-
tuerent, ut illorum furiosas violentias non
paterentur qui veritatem catholicam vel
pradicarent loquendo, vel legerent constitu-
endo.—Sed Dei major misericordia id egi
t ut legati nostri quod susceperant obtinere non
possent. Jam enim nos praevenirent ex aliis
locis quaedam Episcoporum querele gravissi-
me, qui mala fuerant ab ipsis multa perpessi,
& a suis sedibus exturbati, praecipe hor-
renda & incredibilis cades Maximiani Epi-
scopi Catholici Ecclesiae Vagiensis effectit, ut
nostra legatio jam quid agent non haberet.
Jam enim Lex fuerat promulgata, &c. Thus
S. Austin; after which follows a more par-
ticular Relation of their most inhuman
and horrid Usage of the Catholick Bishop
Maximian. They that read these things
in one of those Epistles to which our Mon-
sieur refers us, will scarce think that S. Au-
stin deserved to be called a Beast, and one
that forfeited eternal happiness; and to be
treated in such sort as he is by our Mon-
sieur. Some may be apt to startle at this,
that I should say that our Monsieur calls
S. Austin a Beast, and one that forfeited
eternal happiness; and therefore I shall
produce his words. He (says he) that is
for
for being cruel to those that differ from him, makes himself a Beast, and forfeits eternal happiness, which is promised to reasonable Creatures, not to Savages: But, according to our Monsieur, S. Austin was for being cruel to those that differ'd from him; Therefore, &c.

Our Monsieur rests not here, but goes on labouring to create all the Odium to this Father that he possibibly can. And at last he plainly lays the Persecution of the Protestants in France at his door, telling us a story of the French King, which I hope no body will believe upon his bare word. Tho' if we should suppose it to be true, we need not go far to seek an Answer, our Monsieur having furnished us with one, when he says that he was imposed upon by Flatterers. These Flatterers misrepresented things (as our Monsieur useth to do) and did not inform the King aright, either concerning the Practices of the Donatists, or the Carriage of S. Austin in this matter.

Our Monsieur concludes his Railing against S. Austin with these words; I speak in that manner, who do not use, like many others, to calumniate the Living, and speak untruths in favour of the Dead. But it is well if there be nothing of Calumny in these very words. Howsoever, as we must not
not speak untruths in favour of the Dead, so certainly we ought not to speak such untruths of them as tend to their dispraise or diffamation. And if our Monsieur be guilty of speaking untruths against them, of unjustly accusing them, making them to have promoted such Doctrines as they themselves plainly disown'd; if instead of observing the known Rule of saying nothing but well of the Dead, he say all manner of Evil of them, and that falsely; he is more culpable than he would be if he spoke untruths in favour of the Dead. And therefore it concerns our Monsieur to reflect seriously upon that which he hath said against Dr. Hammond and other persons deceas'd, against the Ancient Fathers and the Apostles themselves.

S E C T. III.

Of Monsieur Le Clerc's Skill in the Hebrew, and other Oriental Languages.

Our Monsieur in many places would seem to have confuted Dr. Hammond's Interpretations of some Hebrew, Chaldee and Syriack words, or had a mind to shew his Skill in interpreting them; and I conceive
ceive it may not be amiss to take a view of these, that it may appear how excellent a Critick he is in these Tongues.

P. 17. in S. Matth. 4. 14.

H. Grotius has observed upon Jam. 2. 23. that it was common for the Hebrews to say, that such or such a place of Holy Scripture was fulfilled, whenever any thing came to pass, resembling what was mention'd in that place. But he gives us no Example of it, and therefore I shall produce one out of R. Solomon upon Gen. 11. 8. where at the words the Lord scattered them abroad, he makes this remark, Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

That which Grotius in Jam. 2. 23. observes, is otherwhere made use of by our Monsieur against both Grotius himself and Dr. Hammond. Hence it is that our Monsieur set himself to find out some Examples of it, and he thought that at last he had found one. But he is so unhappy, as that instead of giving us an Example, in which something resembling that which was mention'd came to pass, he produces an Example wherein
wherein the very same thing came to pass. Solomon's saying, Prov. 10. 24. The fear of the wicked, it shall come upon him, was really and literally verified in those who are mention'd Gen. 11. 8. They feared lest they should be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth, Gen. 11. 4. and this their fear came upon them, for God did scatter them abroad upon the face of the whole earth, v. 8.

This must be acknowledged to be a very gross mistake, and yet our Monsieur is no less mistaken in the translating the words of R. Solomon. He renders them thus, As they had said, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth, so that saying of Solomon was verified concerning them, What he is afraid of shall come upon him. But he should have rendered them thus; In this World that which they said, Lest we be scattered abroad was fulfilled upon them. This is that which Solomon says, Prov. 10. 24. The fear of the wicked, it shall come upon him. It is manifest from the words that they ought to be thus rendered; but as to our Monsieur's rendering, as it agrees not at all with the words, it is not an easy matter to make sense of it.

"Perhaps our Monsieur will take this for a warning, and not be so ready for the future"
Anima
dversions upon
ture to supply Gro
tius with Examples, espe-
cially out of the Rabbins.

P. 39. in S. Matth. 11. 23.

Hades must be deduced from the Hebrew 
 Decrypt, which may be pronounced not only as 
 the Authors of the Masora do ed, but ajid. 
 The Phoenicians perhaps wrote it יד, as it 
 is common for the guttural Letters to be 
 confounded in the Oriental Languages, and 
 as the Arabians at this day write it; and 
 so from יד Hajid came Haides and Hades; 
 and that word, as is very well known, sig-
nifies destruction. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Here our Monsieur very stoutly bids de-
fiance not only to Dr. Hammond, but to all 
 the Greek Grammarians with him. With 
 all the Greek Grammarians leave (says he) 
 I should say, that this is not the true Ety-
mology of the word; so our Monsieur. But 
 tho’ the Etymology mention’d by Dr. Ham-
mond is not in his account a true one, yet 
 he resolves that we shall have a true one. 
 Haides or Hades is according to him to be 
 deduced from יד Hajid, which signifies 
 Destruction. You will ask perhaps, Where 
 do’s he find the word יד? But as to that 
 you
you must excuse him; he can find an Hebrew word וֹּן according to the Masores Ed, which may signify destruction, but not וֹּן. What hath he then to say for this true Etymology? All that he has to say for it is either nothing, or not to the purpose. He says, The Phænicians perhaps wrote it וֹּן which is just nothing, or only shews that our Monsieur could not prove that the Phænicians did write it so. 2. He says that the Arabians at this day write it so, which is not to the purpose; suppose it to be true. If we were assured that the Arabians writ it so before the word Hades was known in the World, it would be to the purpose; but as to their writing it so at this day, it signifies nothing, be it true or false. Therefore to conclude this, I cannot but think it better to acquiesce in the Ætymology of the word Hades which the Greek Grammarians give us, than to travel so far as our Monsieur doth for another.

P. 43. in S. Matth. 12. 8.

In Dan. 7. 13. the Son of Man is taken for a Man, and not for the name of the Messias, whatever was the use of that Phrase in Christ's time. I saw (says the Prophet) in the night-visions, and behold

F 2 there
there came in the Clouds of Heaven one like the Son of Man, וּכְלַי אָנָשׁ, i.e. the appearance of a Man. This is known to be the constant use of the Phrase in the Old Testament; and that Christ should sometimes use it in the same signification, will not seem strange to any, tho' at other times he calls himself the Son of Man, or a Man. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadg.

When our Monsieur says, There came one וּכְלַי אָנָשׁ, i.e. the appearance of a Man; some think this not to be very good Sense, and that he should have said in the appearance of a Man. But I will suppose this to have been the fault of the Printer, and so wave it. Dr. Hammond in S. Matth. 12. note a near the beginning, says, that the Phrase, the Son of Man, is used for Christ, Dan. 7. 13. This our Monsieur denies, saying, that in Dan. 7. 13. the Son of Man is taken for a Man, and adding (as a reason) that this is known to be the constant use of this phrase in the Old Testament. To which I answer,

1. In saying that the Son of Man, Dan. 7. 13. is taken for a Man, and that this is the constant use of the Phrase in the Old Testament, he doth not contradict Dr. Hammond's
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mond's Interpretation; for Christ was a Man, tho' not an ordinary Man, as the person spoken of Dan. 7. 13. was not an ordinary Person, but such an one as was brought near before the Ancient of days; and v. 14. there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him, his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

2. Our Monsieur furniseth us with an Answer to his own Reason, for as he here saith, that tho' at other times Christ calls himself the Son of Man in the New Testament, yet S. Matth. 8. 12. that Phrase signifies Man in General; so may I say, tho' at other times the Son of Man signifies no more than Man in the Old Testament, yet Dan. 7. 13. it signifies the Christ.

3. If we should grant that the Phrase the Son of Man does not signify the Christ in other places of the Old Testament, the many Texts in the New Testament, in which it signifies so, may be a sufficient warrant to us to expound it so, Dan. 7. 13. Our Monsieur himself owns that Christ calls himself the Son of Man many times in the New Testament, and Dr. Hammond hath taken notice of 88 Repetitions of the Phrase, in every of which it is used, for
for Christ. And it is very observable, that as it is said Dan. 7. 13. Behold one like the Son of Man came with the Clouds of Heaven, so our Saviour says S. Matth. 24. 30. and 26. 64. Ye shall see the Son of Man coming in the Clouds of Heaven; and therefore some have with good reason conceived that in using these words he had respect to that Place in Daniel. I shall only add that R. Solomon, R. Jesuah ap. Aben Ezra, R. Saadia and Zachiades among the Jewish Expositors, and the greatest part of the Christian do with Dr. Hammond expound Dan. 7. 13. of the Christ or Messiah.

P. 46. in S. Matth. 12. 32.

It is very true, that ריביל, which properly signifies a word, is taken very often for a thing; but the phrase to speak a word אמר ריביל was never used to signify to do any thing. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

He that reads this without consulting Dr. Hammond may be apt to think that the Dr. had said that אמר דיבר signifies to do a thing: but if he look into Dr. Hammond, he will find that he do's not say this; yea
in the place which our Monsieur refers us to (viz. in S. Matth. 12. note b) he doth not as much as mention those Hebrew Words. All that he says is, that it is ordinary in the Hebrew Dialect for speaking to signify doing, and word to signify thing, which is very true. We have a remarkable instance of it, Gen. 31. 24, 29. Take heed (says God to Laban) that thou speak not to Jacob either good or evil, i.e. as the most learned and judicious Fagiis interprets it, nihil omnino mali facias. And long before him Laban himself did thus interpret it, v. 29. It is (says he) in the power of my hand to do you hurt, but the God of your Father spake to me yesterday, saying, Take heed that thou speak not to Jacob either good or evil, i.e. Take heed that thou do Jacob no hurt. It is in my power (says Laban) to hurt thee, but the Lord hath warned me not to do thee hurt. Laban did speak evil to Jacob, chid with him, charged him with Stealth, &c. but he durst not do him the least hurt, because God had admonish'd him that he should not. As to our Monsieur did not know how rarely it occurs in the Scripture. We have it, Jer. 13. 12. but I do not remember that I have met with it otherwhere, tho' there is nothing more frequent
frequent than רֶפֶת הָעָרָה is; and as our Monsieur says that the Noun יִרְבּוֹ וּרְבֵי signifies both word and thing, so the Verb רְבִּי tho' it is rightly render'd to speak, yet the meaning of it is to-do (as I have shew'd just now) in Gen. 31. 24:

P. 70. in S. Matth. 20. 15.

The Hebrew words נָפַל שִׁבְרִי מְשֻׁלֶּשׁ are not rightly translated by the Dr. he hath received his hire in peace, but ought to be rendered he received his whole hire. He seems in his haste to have read נָפַל מְשֻׁלֶּשׁ tho' that has no Sense in it here.

Animadv.

But why is our Monsieur so confident that Dr. Hammond's Translation is not right, and that his own is? In the Judgment of a very great person נָפַל מְשֻׁלֶּשׁ may be rendred either Perfect or in Peace; נָפַל מְשֻׁלֶּשֶׁר perfectus, perfecte pacatus, pace donatus, Isa. 42. 19. So he, viz. Buxtorf. In like manner Tremellius in that place of Isaiah renders it, donatus pace, a People that was in a covenant of Peace with God, and accordingly Grotius renders it Fæde-ratus. Our Monsieur therefore is mistaken when he will have Dr. Hammond to have read
Monsieur Le Clerc's Reflections.

read וַיִּשְׁלָם, and imputes it to his hater. He is also under a mistake when he says: That in peace has no sense in it here; for why may it not pass for good sense if any say, He hath receiv'd his hire in peace, i.e. peaceably, or with content and satisfaction.

P. 71. in S: Matth. 20. 16.

The רָאִים, Num. 16. 2. are the called together of the Assembly, and רָאִים the called-out of the Assembly, or to the Assembly. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Dr. Hammond in S. Matth. 20. note e observes that our Translation hath The renowned of the Congregation, where the Hebrew hath רַעִית, The called, Numb. 1. 16. But our Monsieur (who must oppose that which Dr. Hammond approves) renders it The called out of the Assembly, or to the Assembly, and also corrects the Text, reading רַעִית, when in the Text it is רַעִית. If you ask what warrant or authority he hath to correct either the Text, or our Translation, he produces none at all. Dr. Hammond also thought that ἐπὶ ἀπεικόνισεν τῆς συναγωγῆς in the LXX, Numb. 1. 16.
1. 16. signifies the renowned of the Congregation, and in favour of this allledged Hebræus, who explains ἁλίσια by ὡδὸς; and so if ἐπίκλησις is the same with ἁλίσια (which our Monsieur seems to grant in this very Page) ἐπίκλησις also signifies ὡδὸς; i.e. renowned or famous. Now what says our Monsieur to this? Nothing at all, but after his magisterial way tells us, that ἐπίκλησις συναγωγῆς in Numb. 1. 16. are those that were chosen or called by name out of the Congregation, alluding Herodotus. So (says he) Xerxes in Herodotus takes counsel about his flight, ἄνα τοῖς ὑπανακτοῖς, with the Persians, called together about him: Thus our Monsieur, who is here guilty of two things which he reproves in others. 1. He blames others for alluding Testimonies, and not directing us to the places where we might find them; so our Monsieur here does not direct us where these words are to be found in Herodotus. 2. In this very Page 71. he is very severe upon the LXX. for not having regard to Grammar in their Translation; and so our Monsieur himself had little regard to Grammar in interpreting Herodotus's words. If he had translated them With those that were called together of the Persians, this had been more agreeable to the words; but to render them With the Persians called together about him, is not tolerable.
tolerable. The Latin Version in *Herodotus*, l. 8. c. 101. hath Delectos Persarum proce-
res, and accordingly it may be rendred *With
some choice Men, or Men of Renown for their
Wisdom, Integrity, &c. among the Persians.
I shall only add, that as "לשת" here, Numb.
1. 16. is by the LXX rendred ἑπεξηλθον, so
מאז, Ἐζɛk. 23. 23. is rendred by them
alone.

P. 75. in *S. Matth. 21. 41.*

*This could not be express'd the same way
in the Syrian and Chaldee Dialect, but only
by אביכא יבר in destroying he will destroy.
Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.*

*Animadv.*

If our Monsieur had consulted his Sy-
riack Grammar, that would have told him
that אביכא יבר is not the Syriack Dialect.

P. 89. in *S. Matth. 26. 7*

*As for the word Alabaaster, it is an Ara-
bian name for that kind of Marble, for
is the Noun it self in use, which by an ad-
dition of the Arabian Article ש becomes
ל to αλδβαστον. Thus Monsieur Le
Clerc.*

*Animadv.*
If our Monsieur had refer'd us to any Arabick Writer, in whom we might have found the word Alabaster us'd as the name of that kind of Marble; or if he had produced any authority for it, we might have listen'd to the account that he here gives us: but since he produces none, it is as easily rejected as it is confidently affirmed. Yea, he himself soon abates of his confidence, for tho' in the words which I have transcribed he affirms so positively that it is an Arabian name, yet in the very next words he tells us that he thinks so, The reason (says he) why I think it had an Arabian name. But let us hear the Reason which moved him to think so, or rather Reasons, for he gives us two instead of one. The former is, because it begins with at the Arabian Article; the latter, because it was cut out of the Arabian Mountains, and was first brought from thence. And must not every one confess that these are very cogent Reasons? Especially when he observes how much our Monsieur troubles himself to prove this, that Alabaster was cut out of the Arabian Mountains, and first brought from thence, but in vain. He tells us that Pliny, l. 36. c. 7. says that the Ancients thought that
that Alabaster grew in the Mountains of Arabia, and nowhere else; but he himself answers this in the very next words, telling us, that the same Pliny a little after says, that it grows about Thebes in Egypt, and Damascus in Syria. This Answer is sufficient of itself; but we may observe further, that tho’ our Monsieur renders it Alabaster grew in the Mountains of Arabia, in Pliny it is Onychem; so that if the Onyx be not the same with Alabaster, our Monsieur hath not rightly translated him. Now Pliny himself seems to me to make it doubtful whether it be the same, when he says, L. 36. c. 8. Hunc aliqui lapidem alabastriten vocant. We see he only says Aliqui, they were only some that call’d it so. But we need not trouble ourselves about it whether they be the same or no; For as to the Onyx, Pliny tells us that there wanted not some who made it to grow in Germany, which is against those that thought it to grow only in Arabia. And as to the lapis alabastrites, the same Pliny acquaints us, that it grows about Thebes in Egypt, and Damascus in Syria, and in Carmania, and India in Asia, &c. but he makes no mention of Arabia.

Thus far our Monsieur is little help’d by Pliny; but he goes on and says, that there was a City somewhere between the Nile
Nile and the Red Sea, or in Egyptian Arabia, called for that reason 'Alābāra, which is mention'd by Pliny, l. 5. c. 9. and by Ptolemy l. 4. c. 5. who places it in the Province of Cynopolis, near to which was the Alabaster Mountain mention'd by the same Author; Thus our Monsieur. And in Pliny I find mention of a Town called Alabastron in the Text, but the Margin shews that others read Alastron, which makes not for our Monsieur in the least. In Ptolemy there is a City which he calls 'Alābāra, and not far from it Alabastrinus mons, but neither Ptolemy nor Pliny doth assign the reason of the name (as our Monsieur doth) nor do they say that they were in Arabia. Yes they were between the Nile and the Red Sea or in Egyptian Arabia, so our Monsieur; but I should rather say Arabian Egypt, for that part of Egypt which was Westward from the Nile was call'd Libyca, that which was Eastward from it Arabica, as the Inhabitants of the one were call'd Liby-egyptii, of the other Arabaegyptii. We see now how firmly our Monsieur hath prove that Alabaster was cut out of the Arabian Mountains. In all his Testimonies (beside the first) there is not any mention of Arabia, and in the first Pliny speaks of the Onyx, not the Alabaster. And where-
as our Monsieur says further, that Alabaster was first brought from Arabia, there is nothing in all his Testimonies that sounds that way.

As to the word לַעַבָּר, the Arabick Lexicographers make it sometimes to signify Lapides subalbidi, but I have not found that it signifies Marble, or this kind of it which is call’d Alabaster. And to conclude this, if Alabaster was an Arabian Name, it is strange that the Authors of the Arabick Versions did not retain it, but instead of it they have S. Matth. 26. 7. לַעַבָּר, and S. Mar. 14. 3. לַעַבָּר.

P. 89. in S. Matth. 26. 7. Note c.

I have shew’d in a Note on Mat. 25. 21. that מִשְׁתַּחַת there, and sometimes the Hebrew מִשְׁתַּחַת, signifies a Feast. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

It may be thought strange that a Man should tell us so confidently, that in such a Note he had shewed that מִשְׁתַּחַת signifies a Feast, when in that Note he do’s not name the word מִשְׁתַּחַת; and I am satisfied that he cannot name any place in the whole Bible, where it has that signification.

P. 91.
P. 91. in S. Matth. 27. 5.

The Hebrew word הָרֵעַ in Job 7. 15. is rightly render'd by Aquila, ἀγγέλλων, a halter, because the thing intended is evidently a squeezing of the Throat with a Rope, as a way of dying: My soul hath chosen strangling, and death rather than my bones; i.e. My grief is so great, that I had rather die by strangling, or any other sort of death, than live. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad-v.

Dr. Hammond by הָרֵעַ Job 7. 15. understood Strangling, Suffocation or Depriving of breath; and so the Chaldee Paraphrast, our English Translators and many more do interpret it; but our Monsieur will have it to signify an halter, for he says that it is rightly render'd by Aquila, ἀγγέλλων, an halter. To which I say, that it is very true that Aquila renders it by ἀγγέλλων, and Dr. Hammond and many others have observed it; but that which may be questioned is, whether by ἀγγέλλων, Aquila intended to signify an halter; for tho' it may sometimes signify laqueus, a snare or halter, yet I believe our Monsieur will not say that it do's not also signify Strangling; and indeed this is the prima-
primary signification of it, and laqueus is call'd שורמ only upon this account because it strangles.

Our Monsieur also says, that the thing intended is a squeezing the Throat with a Rope. But how doth he prove this? He says that it is evident, and so no proof is necessary; and yet his own Gloss upon Job 7.15. which presently follows, shews that it is not evident. He makes holy Job to speak thus; My grief is so great, that I had rather die by strangling than live. According to him then Job did not chuse to die by a Rope or Halter, but by Strangling; now a Man may be strangled other ways than by an Halter, as our Monsieur confesses a little after, that יָדוֹ signifies to choke or suffocate by any means whatsoever.

P. 96. in S. Matth. 28. 19.

These תַּנִּים and תַּנִּים are in the name of a Son of Free-men, or in the name of Proselytism, is to receive Baptism upon condition that the person baptized be called a Free-man or Proselyte. Consult Selden de Jure Nat. & Gent. l. 2. c. 3. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Our Monsieur refers us to Mr. Selden, but I believe after all that he is singular in his Explication of these Phrases, To be baptized in the name of a Son of Free-men, and in the name of Proselytism. The learned Mr. Selden never dreamt of receiving Baptism upon any such condition, he explains it of any one's being baptiz'd ut libertatem vol integrum Proselytt justi jus sibi adscribereur, that he might obtain his liberty, or the full right of a Proselyte. And surely there is a great difference between these two, a person's being baptiz'd that he may obtain the Rights of a Free-man or Proselyte, and his being baptiz'd upon condition that he be call'd a Free-man or Proselyte.

Our Monsieur here adds, That Grotius has committed a mistake in his Translation of the last words, but discerned however the import of the Phrase, tho' just as a Man sees the Moon through the Clouds. But let it be supposed that Grotius did discern the import of the Phrase only as we see the Moon through a Cloud, our Monsieur ought not to have objected it to him, who did not discern the import of it at all. And if Grotius committed a mistake in translating the last
last words (viz. יהו, לְשׁוֹן נוֹרָה) it is a pardonable one. He alleged these words out of Maimonides, where he speaks of a woman taken in war, and baptized, and made a Proselyte. This induced Grotius to think that יְהוֹ רֹעַ יִשָּׁר was of the Plural number, and accordingly he translates it Pro
termum, whereas Mr. Selden (whom our Monsieur follows) took it to be the Sin
gular number, and rendered it Proselytism.

P. 100. in S. Mar. 6. 2.

And so the Hebrew יִשָּׁר, which is very frequently rendered by סְטָר, is sometimes used as Isa. 29. 16. יִשָּׁר How shall the work say of him that made it, be made not? Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvers.

Our Monsieur would persuade us that יִשָּׁר sometimes signifies how, alleging Isa. 29. 16. but I would know what necessity there is that יִשָּׁר should be so rendered in that place. Our Translators (not to mention any more) render it For, and make the Sense very clear, For shall the work say to him that made it &c? And I believe that our Monsieur cannot produce any In
terpreter,
interpreters, either ancient or modern, that translates it *How*. I know that Nollius in concord. particul. p.402. will have sometimes to signify *How*, alledgeing sundry places of Scripture in which he interprets it so; but *Isa. 29. 16.* (the place which our Monsieur instances in) is none of them: and I add, that there is no necessity of interpreting it so in the places which Nollius mentions.

P. 104. in S. Mar. 7. 22.

*Psal. 14. 1.* the word יבל mad do's not signify one that is mad through a bodily distemper, or is imprudent through the error of his mind, but a wicked evilman. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

*Animad.*

I know not why יבל is by our Monsieur here render'd *Mad*, or why he troubles himself to tell us that it do's not signify one that is mad through a bodily distemper, for I do not remember that any have interpreted it so. But it is more strange that he should say, that it do's not signify one that is imprudent through an error in his mind, or (in short) a Fool, when the greatest part of Interpreters to-
together with the Chaldee Paraphrafs do here render it so. It is most true, that he of whom the Psalmist here speaks is a wicked man, as well as a Fool; but it do's not follow thence that בלב is not in this place rightly rendred The Fool. It is his folly in thinking that there is no God that makes him wicked; his wicked, corrupt and abominable practice proceeds from the error of his mind. Add hereto that our Monsieur gives no reason for that which he says, that בלב here do's not signify one that is imprudent through an error in his mind or a Fool; but the very Text affords a good reason for the contrary, for every one that says in his heart that there is no God is a Fool. From the Hebrew word בלב our Monsieur passeth to the Greek word ἀφρος, and will correct our mistakes in the Interpretation of that. And here Suidas and Phavorinus fall under his reprehension, those excellent Criticks cannot escape the lash of this great Critick. His words are these, And hence it came to pass that Phavorinus and Suidas before him misinterpreted the word ἀφρος by ὅ μὴ εἰδός τοῦ ὄρμος Γεων, ἀμφίθετο τῆς σοφίας. Our Monsieur says, Hence it came to pass. I ask whence? That which goes before is that בלב is by the LXX translated ἀφροσύνη and בלב ἀφρος, so that the mistake, of G 3 which
which our Monsieur makes those two great Persons guilty, proceeded from the LXX's Interpretation of those Hebrew words in our Monsieur's Opinion. Because the LXX rightly interpreted וְיָדוּ and יְדוּ, Suidas and Phavorinus misinterpreted אָדַם. But I shall not insist upon this; That which I am most unsatisfied in is, that our Monsieur will not allow that Suidas and Phavorinus have rightly explain'd אָדַם. As to Suidas, he hath not the former words, but the latter only, by which he explains qualis, not אָדַם; quia, quia in veris verba, quia; so Suidas. And Phavorinus is shewing the difference between אָדַם and אָדַם, and explains אָדַם by the words which our Monsieur has transcribed. And when he says that אָדַם is he that knows not the true God, he had his eye upon Psal. 14.1. where it is said, The fool (אָדַם) has said in his heart, There is no God, so that Phavorinus has the Psalmist's Authority to shelter and secure him. But why did not our Monsieur fall upon Hesychius (rather than Suidas and Phavorinus) who interprets אָדַם by מַעֵדָה and מַעֵדָה.

P. 107. in S. Mar. 9. 49.

The Expression in Hebrew is יָדוּ, for every יָדוּ וְיָדוּו, יָדוּ וְיָדוּו; one
one shall be consumed by fire, and every Offering of Corn shall be season'd with Salt. And in the same manner it may be express'd in Syriak, as appears by the Syriack Interpreter. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadw.

I do not see how it appears from the Syriack Interpreter that it may be express'd in the same manner. The Syriack Interpreter in our Polyglot hath not מְנַחָא, nor yet the word מִסִיָא by which he renders מִנְחָא Levit. 2. 13. nor אַסְכִיָא, by which he renders it in other Places of the Old Testament, but מְנַחִיתא. It is true that the Syriack Interpreter hath the word מְנַחִיתא, where our Monsieur puts מְנַחָא, but that מְנַחִיתא any where signifies To be consumed, as מְנַחָא is by some suppos'd to signify, Isa. 51. 6. I have not yet found. Our Monsieur says positively that Christ made use of the word מְנַחָא, but he only says it, for he knew that it was impossible to prove it.

P. 126. in S. Luke 1. 73.

Our Author supposes with others, that the name of Zacharias's Wife was אָלִישְׁבְּע הָאָלִישְׁבְּע, but
but if that had been her name, she should have been call'd in Greek 'Ελισαβέτ or 'Ελισβέτ. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvc.

The reasons why Dr. Hammond and others suppose that her name was אלישבע were possibly these. 1. Because the name of Aaron's Wife was אלישבע. Exod. 6. 23. and it is rendred by the LXX's Ελισβετ, or 'Ελισβετ. 2. Because they saw that the Syriack Version (not to mention the Persian) doth always call Zacharias's Wife by the name of זביה S. Luk. 1. 5, 13, &c. And whether these reasons do not much outweigh that little Argument which our Monsieur urges against it, I leave to the decision of any unprejudiced person.

P. 143. in S. Luk. 16. 19.

That part of the Parable in which there is a mistake in the Doctor's Translation, is word for word according to the Talmudical Dialect thus; A King of flesh and blood made a great Feast, and called to it all the Children of his City. There came a certain poor Man and stood at the Gate, &c. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvc.
Our Monsieur taking upon him to translate the Hebrew (as it is in Mr. Sheringham in Prefat. ad Cod. Joma.) word for word should have been more exact in the doing it, which if he had been, he would have rendered it thus, *A Parable of a King of Flesh and Blood, who made a great Feast, and invited all, &c.* This I could not but note, both because it shews how rightly Dr. Hammond says that the *Title of this passage is a parable of a King of Flesh and Blood*, and because it gives me an opportunity to defend Mr. Sheringham, being accus'd here by our Monsieur for using more freedom than ordinary in translating this passage. For if he had look'd forward, he would have found in Mr. Sheringhams Preface, that the Translation is not his; for he owns that he transcrib'd both the Hebrew and the Translation of it from *Cunradus Otto* in his Gali Rezia. I only add, that the Hebrew in *Cunrad. Otto* which Mr. Sheringham transcribes, differs much from that which is in the *Gemara Bably. cap. 5.* near the beginning, the place to which *Cunr. Otto* refers us. Particularly the words לしようו ערי, upon the account of which our Monsieur falls
falls so foul both upon Dr. Hammond and Mr. Sheringham, are not in the Gemara, as he would have seen if he had consulted it, which so great a pretender ought to have done.

P. 151. in S. Luke 22. 52.

That there was a Guard kept in the second Temple, the Talmudists assure us in Cod. Middoth cap. i. l. i. and 2. And the Captain of this Garrison was a Jew, whom the Talmudists call הר חבירי, the man of the Mountain of the House, or הרו המ dışı, the Head of the Watch, as appears from the foremention'd place in the Talmud. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

But how do's it appear from the foremention'd place in the Talmud, that the Captain of the Garrison was call'd, either by the one name or by the other? The latter of them, viz. הרו המ dışı, is not found in the foremention'd place Cod. Middoth c. i. f. 1. and 2. The former is found f. 2. but it is not said that the הר חבירי was Captain of the Guard or Garrison. He went about through all the Watches, and if he found any one sleeping, he might beat him, or
or burn his garments; and this is all the account that the Talmud gives there of him. The Jews indeed in their Glosses explain it by על שמה פלא down one that was appointed over all the several Watches, and yet perhaps he was only one of the Course which then waited, who was appointed to walk the Round through all the Guards every night.

P. 152. in S. Luke 22. 52.

The sacred Functions of the Levites are more than once stiled by Moses a Warfare נָשָׁיָה; for Numb. 8. 24, 25. where the LXX have λειβρία. And therefore he that was chief over the Levites might very well be called נשיא, which in Greek is usually rendred by σάρκις. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadver.

Our Monsieur expresses himself very warily, when he says that the LXX have λειβρία, Numb. 8. 24, 25. For it is true that they have that word ν. 25. but it is not the Hebrew word נָשָׁיָה (or not that alone) which they render by it, but נשיא העברים, as it is usual with them to render נשיא alone by λειβρία. Our Monsieur says also that is in Greek usually rendred by σάρκις, but we
we have only his bare word for it, he do's not direct us to any place where we may find it rendred so. By the LXX. it is constantly rendred αριστήτης (see Josb. 5.15, 1 Sam. 12.9, &c.) not ηποίης.

P. 183. in S. Job. 1. 14.

Grace and Truth] i. e. in Hebrew הערת ואמת. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

I doubt of this, because in sundry places in which those two Hebrew words come together, I do not find that הערת is rendred Χαες. In the place which our Monsieur mentions, viz. Gen. 24. 27. 'tis rendred שועוע, in Psal. 25. 10. 85. 11. 89. 15. אֱלֹהִי. Yea I never found it rendred Χαες in all the Scripture but once, viz. Esth. 2. 9.

P. 187. in S. Job. 2. 23.

Ἐξεφύσην εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.] This might be express'd in Hebrew by וְאָמַר הֵם לְשֵׁנִי. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Monsieur Le Clerc's Reflections.

Animadver.

I would know what the Conjunction י doth here, there being no יא in the Greek to answer to it. It is not here יא משוער as מילות is rendred Exod. 14. ult. Those that are better skilled in these Languages than our Monsieur is, would (I believe) have express'd it by יאהים ובשוה, according to the expression יאהים ובשוה Psal. 78. 22.

P. 189. in S. Joh. 3. 21.

The Hebrew יָשָׁן Truth is taken for righteousness and goodness in 2 Chron. 32. 1. and so the Greek ἀληθεία is used in Eph. 5. 9. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadver.

The one of these is just as true as the other. I think that there are few beside our Monsieur that will expound Eph. 5. 9. as he doth. The words are these, The fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness, and ἀληθεία, truth. Now if Truth here signifies Righteousness and Goodness (as our Monsieur says it do's) the sense will be this, The fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness.
ness and righteousness, and righteousness or
goodness. As to חָיָה in 2 Chron. 32. 1. it
is by our Translators rendered Establishment,
by Tremellius Firmam constitutionem; the
LXX, as also the Chald. Syr. Vulg. & Mont-
tan retain the usual signification, and ren-
der it Truth. And I have not as yet met
with any that have translated it Righteous-
ness or Goodness. I know that the Latin
Interpretation of the Syriack Version in
our Polyglot hath æquitatem, but there was
no necessity of rendring it so; for the Sy-
riack word is נְשָׁרְיָהּ which signifies Truth,
as is vulgarly known. The M.S. Targum
upon Chronicles in the University-Library
in Cambridge, hath the word נְשָׁרְיָהּ of the
same significature.

P. 192. in S. Joh. 5. 39.

Perhaps Christ us’d the word נְשָׁרְיָה, which
at that time did not signify simply to inquire,
but to search into the Allegorical meaning of
any passage. Consult Buxtorf in Thefauro.
Thus Monsieur LeClere.

Animadu.

The Question here is not whether the
modern Rabbi’s use נְשָׁרְיָה in such a signi-
fication, but whether it did signify so at
that
that time, i.e. when our Saviour bids the Jews to search the Scriptures, S. Joh. 5:39. Our Monsieur positively affirms that it did signify so at that time, but without tender of any proof of it. Only he says, Consult Buxtorf in Thesaurus if you doubt, but forgets to direct us where in his Thesaurus we may find that which will satisfy us, and I have sought for it in vain. I have also consulted Buxtorf's Lexicon Talmudico-Rabbin. but with the same success. Thus our Monsieur, who often upbraids Dr. Hammond with giving blind directions, is guilty thereof himself.

P. 217. in Act. 3. 19.

Our learned Author's memory here fail'd him. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadver.

Dr. Hammond in Act. 3. Note a hath these words: So the name of Noah, from that same Hebrew word which is rendered Consolation, signifies Deliverance; and was impos'd as a Prophecy, that Mankind, which otherwise had been universally destroy'd, should in him be rescued from utter ruin. Thus Dr. Hammond, whose Memory here fail'd him, says our Monsieur. But there are
are several things comprehended in this sentence, and I would know in which of them the Doctor’s memory fail’d him.

1. Dr. Hammond seems to make the name Noah to be from the Hebrew word, which is rendred Consolation; did his memory fail him in this? I suppose not; but if he erred in this, the fault was in his Judgment, and did not proceed from any failure of his Memory; and if he did not err, we cannot impute any fault either to his Memory or his Judgment. This may be said, that divers learned Men have not thought it strange that the name Noah should be from יְנֵ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ הָיָ֣ h

...
2. Dr. Hammond says, that the name of Noah signifies Deliverance; but how our Monsieur can say that his Memory fail’d him in this, I cannot understand. It was not Dr. Hammond’s meaning that Deliverance is the direct and proper signification of that name, but only that as it signifies Consolation, it might also denote Deliverance; for (as he says a little before) times of refreshment and consolation were put for the time of any special deliverance. Every deliverance is matter of comfort and refreshment.

3. Did Dr. Hammond’s Memory fail him; when he said, that the name was impos’d as a Prophecy, that Mankind should in him be rescued from utter ruine? To this I say, that undoubtedly this was his judgment, and consequently the failure (if there was any) was not of his Memory, but in his Judgment. Perhaps our Monsieur may reply, that it was his not remembering the words of the Text, Gen. 5. 29. which betray’d him to this Error in his Judgment. But I am not of that opinion; I rather conceive that the Doctor did not restrain the curse of the earth, mention’d in that Text, to the barrenness of it, but took it in a more comprehensive sense, so as to include the Floud as part of it. And certainly the Earth’s being wholly depriv’d of its Inhabitants (they
Animadversions upon being destroy'd by an universal Deluge) would have been a very heavy Curse upon it, from which it was rescued in Noah, who with his Family being preserved alive, did repeople and replenish it. Yea, Gen. 8. 21. the Flood is plainly call'd the Curse of God upon the Earth; for we there read thus, The Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake, neither will I again smite any more every thing living as I have done.

P. 225. in Acts 8. 32.

Grotius justly rejects the opinion of Beza, who thought that the word πειραμα was made out of the Hebrew פשך, tho' there is no great difference between them either in sound or signification. Nor is Dr. Hammond's Conjecture any thing more probable, which relies upon the same grounds with that of Beza. Grotius has shown out of Cicero that πειραμα is a genuine Greek word which signifies a Period. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Our Monsieur makes use of Grotius's Authority, and yet at the same time contradicts
tradiets him. According to our Monsieur there is no great difference between περιοχε and השר as either in sound or signification, whereas Grotius denies that περιοχε has quicquam commune cum Hebreo השם prius fortuitam sunt; vicinitatem.

Our Monsieur would also persuade us that Dr. Hammond's Conjecture is not any thing more probable than Beza's is; in the mean time he do's not acquaint us what it is, for (if he had) it would have appear'd at the first sight how untruly he says, that it is not more probable than Beza's. Περιοχε is the Hebrew ו リב, the name of a Section or lesser Division of Scripture; thus Dr. Hammond in Act. 8. Noteg. Now who sees not that there is a nearer affinity between ו リב (or השר) and Περιοχε than there is between השר and Περιοχε? How Grotius shews out of Cicero that Περιοχε is a genuine Greek word I do not understand; for he barely cites Tully's words, without commenting upon them; and as to Cicero himself, in the words alleged by Grotius he do's neither say, nor as much as intimate that it is a genuine Greek word.
P. 225. in Act. 8. 33.

The words in the Hebrew are to be rendered thus, By reason of force and punishment he was taken away, or by reason of restraint and punishment; for the Verb נשים signifies both to force and to restrain. The Prophet's meaning is, that Christ suffered that punishment of death, by reason the Jews hindered Pilate to pass an equitable sentence upon him, or forced him as it were to condemn him. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadversion.

Ought not our Monsieur to have instanced in some place of Scripture, in which נשים signifies force, as that is distinguished from restraint? Ought he not also to have given some reason why he renders פועש by punishment, rather than by judgment? I do not see why the greatest Critick should think it below him to render a reason of his interpreting the words of Scripture thus and thus; especially when there are few (perhaps none) that interpret them as he doth, and when his interpretation contributes very little to the clearing the meaning of the Text, which is the case here.
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here. I acknowledge that the Text, Isa. 53. 8. is a very difficult Text, and therefore it cannot be thought strange if there be different Expositions of it; but amongst Christian Expositors, I think, that there is scarce any more unhappy in their Explanation of it than our Monsieur is.

P. 226. in Act. 8. 33.

It is not, as the Doctor tells us, the word יתּ in the Hebrew, but יראה, that is rendered αὐνῶτις. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

It is not, as our Monsieur tells us, that is rendered οὐναοῦς, Jer. 9. 2. but יראה hatsereth, as it is pointed in our Bibles.

P. 226. in Act. 10. 4.

The Hebrew word allledged by our Author signifies Incense or Perfume, not an Offering. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

Dr. Hammond doth not say that the Hebrew word allledged by him signifies an Offer-
Offering, but with the LXX he renders it a Memorial. Having cited Levit. 2.9. he adds these words, Where it is clearly affirmed of the Μνημόσυνον ἀσύμ the Memorial, that it is an Offering, &c. So that according to Dr. Hammond the Hebrew word mention’d by him signifies a Memorial, not an Offering, tho’ Levit. 2.9. it is affirm’d of the Memorial that it was an Offering.

P. 231. in Act. 16. 16.

The Phœnician word שִׁכָּב signifies both a Serpent and a Prophet. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

What the Phœnician word שִׁכָּב signifies I know not, unless it signify the same that it doth in the Hebrew; and I am apt to think that our Monsieur knows not much more of it than I do. In the Hebrew the word may sometimes signify an enchantment or divination or soothsaying, ὅωναρ, as the LXX render it Numb. 23. 23. but I do not find that it any where signifies either a Prophet or a Prophetess.
P. 231. in Act. 16. 16.

The Hebrew דב does not signify the Belly but the Womb: It is rendered indeed by the LXX ἐγκαρπίωθος, but not rightly, it being rather to be rendered ἐνυφαμένος. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Here our Monsieur chastises Dr. Hammond for having said that דב signifies the Belly, and because the LXX interpreting it by ἐγκαρπίωθος do favour the Doctor, he falls also upon them, and tells them plainly that they are mistaken. But if any ask, How appears it that they are mistaken? our Monsieur has nothing to say to that, save only that he hath shewn it somewhere in his Notes on Levit. So that, if we desire satisfaction, we must seek for it we know not where. On the other hand, I am the more satisfied that the interpretation of the LXX is right, because it is not only once or twice that they interpret it so, but they do it so constantly, that I think that there is but one place in all the Bible where they render it otherwise, viz. Job 32. 19. where other Interpreters as well as they make it to have a different signification.
cation from that which it hath in other places, and where our Translators, with many others, render it a Bottle, as the Chaldean-Paraphraast also doth. And according to some the Ventriloquus is thence called בּן, because he speaks out of his Belly, as out of a Bottle. I know that there are two other places, in which according to some the LXX render בּן otherwise than by ἐγκαφρίμωθες, viz. Isa. 19. 3. and 2 Kings 21. 6. In Isa. 19. 3. they say that the LXX render תְנָבָה by τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ γόνος; but this is a mistake, for it is that is rendered by those words, and they render by τοὺς ἐγκαφρίμωθες as otherwise. The Alexandrian MS. makes this as clear as the light at noon-day, for after ἐγκαφρίμωθες it adds καὶ τοὺς γόνος, which answers to בּן which follows after תְנָבָה in the Hebrew. In the latter place, 2 Kings 21. 6. the Readings vary very much; some Editions have γενείων, others have γελαίων, others γῆλαίων; but the Editio Complutensis hath ἐγκαφρίμωθες, as also Theodoret, ap. Flamin. Nobilium, and it is most probable that these are in the right. Since then the LXX thus constantly interpret the word Μονσieur, doth.
Our Monsieur says that בְּאָ נ signifies the Womb, (not the Belly) but he only says it, he doth not produce any place of Scripture in which it hath that Signification. On the other hand, that it doth not signify the Womb seems to be evident from hence, that a man might have בְּאָ נ as well as a Woman, as appears from Levit. 20. ult. A man or a woman that hath בְּאָ נ. But I suppose our Monsieur feign'd this, that his account of בְּאָ נ might agree better with that which he had given of Python a little before; which he will have to be from פות, which signifies Pudendum muliebre, Isa. 3. 17. Every one sees how far-fetch'd an Etymology this is, and they that please may meet with several accounts of the word Python more probable than that is. If I thought it originally an Hebrew word, I should derive it from יָripe a Serpent or Adder, Psal. 58. 4. Isa. 11. 8. Deut. 32. 33. Job 20. 14. certainly יָripe is nearer to Python both in sound and Signification, than our Monsieur's פות is.

Lastly, our Monsieur affirms that בְּאָ נ is rather to be rendred ἐκκομάνις. But what reasons foever he might have to move him to think so, whether any or none, the words of Scripture, Deut. 18. 11. are clearly against it. There the Necromancer is plainly distinguished from a consulter of בְּאָ נ. There shall
shall not be found among you a Charmer, or a Consulter with Familiar Spirits (בזים) or a Wizard, or a Necromancer. We see then that a Consulter of בזים and מוטימאמאס, a Necromancer, are clearly made distinct. It is true, that some of those who had this בזים did also pretend to have a power to bring up the Dead (as appears from the History of Saul and the Witch of Endor, 1 Sam. 28. 7, 11.) but if our Monsieur thinks that he may infer thence that בזים is to be rendered מוטימאמאס, he mistakes very much.

P. 232. in Act. 17. 19.

In that language בזים signifies a Mountain of Violence or Incursion, or also of Slaughter. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

By that language he means the Hebrew, or one very like it, as appears from the end of the preceding Sentence. Now in the Hebrew בזים may signify Incursion, as also in the Chaldee, and perhaps in the Syriack, as in the Æthiopick Violence, and in the Arabick a calamitous Death. But what is all this to Slaughter? There may be a calamitous Death, or Incursion, or Violence, and yet no Slaughter. It may be a language very
very like the Hebrew he understands, not any of these which I have mention'd, but a certain language which the Jaones spake, what it was he knows not: And yet he can assure us, that in that language it signified Slaughter.

P. 233. in Alt. 17. 19.

"Apons, the name of Mars, is an Hebrew word, for יר or יר " signifies a Mountainer, as Mars was. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadu.

Our Monsieur had done well if he had directed us to some places of Scripture, where the Hebrew words which he mentions signify a Mountainer. I know that there is one place in which some have render'd ייר so, viz. Jer. 17. 3. but there is no necessity that we should interpret it so. The Chaldee, Syriack and Arabick render it Mountains, our English Translation, O my Mountain, others My Mountain. If our Monsieur will have "Apons to be originally an Hebrew word, methinks he should rather have said that it is from ירוי, Diruit, destruxit, subvertit.
P. 233. in Aet. 17. 19.

She is called the Goddess of Wisdom; and this seems to be intimated by the name Πάλιας, if that be derived from the Hebrew לְהָלֹ, i.e. directed, considered, examined, from whence comes the Noun לְהָלֹ, which signifies Justice. Prov. 16. 11. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

That לְהָלֹ signifies to weigh and consider, I willingly acknowledge, and perhaps also to direct; but that the Noun לְהָלֹ signifies Justice, Prov. 16. 11. is such a mistake, as certainly none but our Monsieur could be guilty of. He found that the LXX in that place have διακονον, or that Aquila hath διακονα, and through Scitancy thought that it was the word לְהָלֹ which they rendered so; whereas it is מְשֵׁה which they translate Justice and Just. I might add, that if it should be granted that the Noun signifies Justice, Prov. 16. 11. (as our Monsieur would have it) it is not at all to his purpose, which is to shew that the name Pallas intimates that she is the Goddess of Wisdom; for Justice and Wisdom are different things. Our Monsieur certainly was
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not awake when he writ this. Of Pallas he faith a little before, that she is call'd 'Ἀστήρ, which (says he) is the same with the Hebrew נָעַר, i. e. valiant. But our Monsieur seems not to be much more happy in his account of this name, than he is in his account of the former. For he will find it a difficult task to shew that נָעַר anywhere signifies Valiant. It frequently signifies Strong, as Numb. 24. 21, &c. But as I said before of Justice and Wisdom, so I say now of Strong and Valiant, that they are not the same. In the mean time this Woman, whosoever she was, is very much obliged to our Monsieur, who makes her to have been ancienly a Queen, and both Wise and Valiant, and that to such an eminent degree, as that she was afterward the Goddess both of Wisdom, and also of War or Valour.

P. 238. in Act. 26. 23.

And נָעַר, which is signifies also quod that, Gen. 31. 52. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

There are indeed some who interpret נָעַר by that, Gen. 31. 52. but there is no necessity of interpreting it so, there being others
others who retain the usual signification, viz. If; as the LXX, the Vulgar, Tremellius, Montanus, &c. and the sense is very good according to every one of these: For if (say the LXX) I do not pass over to thee, nor thou pass over this heap and this pillar for harm to me, well; thus the LXX; and Montanus’s Translation comes very near to it. The Vulgar renders it thus, If either I pass over this heap to thee, or thou pass over it for harm to me, let the God of Abraham and the God of Nachor judge between us. Tremellius renders it to this sense, If either I pass over this heap, I will not pass over it for harm to thee; or if thou pass over it, thou shalt not pass over it for harm to me. See Tremellius’s Notes, as also Mr. Ainsworth’s, in which he grants that it may be thus interpreted.

P. 261. in Rom. 3. 25.

Our learned Author is mistaken in thinking that the Hebrew word נפרה is indifferently rendered ἀλαφίων and καλαπτιωμα. There is only one place in Exod. 26. 34. where the LXX can seem to have translated it by καλαπτιωμα; but if it be more narrowly looked into, it will appear that they read נפרה, which is the name of the Veil that was drawn over against the most holy Place; and
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and thought that Moses was commanded to put the Ark there within that space.—And it is certain that ἡ λαμπάσαμα signifies only a Veil, which ἡ λαμπάσαμα is extended in order to hide any thing, and so they constantly translate הנב. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadu.

Here Dr. Hammond must be mistaken, tho' our Monsieur has nothing to oppose to that which he says, but only a groundless conjecture of his own. He fancies that the LXX did not read חכים נב Exod. 26. 34. but חכים כותב; and the reason that he gives of this conjecture is this, he says that the LXX do constantly render חכים by ἡ λαμπάσαμα. But to this I answer, 1. Was it true that the LXX constantly translate the Hebrew word so, can it be concluded that they translate no other word so? May not divers words have the same signification? 2. It is not true that the LXX constantly render חכים by ἡ λαμπάσαμα, for Exod. 40. 21. they render it by ἡ λαμπάσαμα.

Dr. Hammond had rendred ἡ λαμπάσαμα, a covering, in opposition to which our Monsieur magisterially pronounces that it signifies only a Veil, which ἡ λαμπάσαμα is extended. But I am not of that opinion that it signifies only a Veil, and to shew that this
Animadversions upon

is not the sole signification of it, I shall go no further than to the LXX themselves, who often render ἁλαζαμά α; now that ἁλαζαμά most properly signifies a covering, every one must grant. Particularly they render it so Exod. 40. 21. where our Translation, as also Montanus and others have a covering; and it is distinguished from ἄρην the Veil, which the LXX there call ἀλαζαμάα. I might add that the Verb ἁλαζαμάω or ἁλαζαμάω signifies to cover, as well as to extend.

P. 266. in Rom. 4. 17.

S. Chrysostome's Interpretation is a mere Nicety, as Beza rightly thought, nothing being more common in Scripture than this Phrase before God לְחָזֵי צָלָה, which has no such signification, as in the place alleged by our Author out of Gen. 17. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

When our Monsieur says, As in the place alleged by our Author out of Gen. 17. I suppose his meaning is, that לְחָזֵי צָלָה has not that signification, Gen. 17. 1. which S. Chrysostome gives to ἁλαζαμά here, Rom. 4. 17. To which I say, 1. That Dr. Hammond
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2. That he hath also shew'd that if Gen. 17. 1, "be taken in the signification of Like, as S. Chrysostome takes, the words will have an excellent good sense; for to Walk before me and be perfect, will be the same with Be ye perfect, as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect, S. Matth. 5. 48. I might add, that is not the Phrase us'd Gen. 17. 1. it is there only before me, i.e. Jehovah, or the Lord, as will appear to every one that consults the place.

P. 268. in Rom. 6. 6.

The Hebrew word properly signifies a Bone, not the Body, of which there is no Example. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc:

Animadwr.

Should it be granted that the word does not signify the Body properly, if it signify so by a Synecdoche, it is enough to justify Dr. Hammond, who only says that signifies a Body. Neither ought our Monsieur to have pronounced so confidently that there are no Examples of its signifying a Body, for many eminent Expositors have been of a different opinion. In Exod. 24. 10.
our Translation reads The Body of Heaven, and in like manner Tremellius, Mr. Ainsworth, Montanus, &c. where the word for Body is מ"ע, also Kimchi in lib. Radic. and Solomon Melech in loc. expound it so. The same Kimchi both upon the Psalms and in lib. Radic. interprets it so, Psal. 139.15. likewise R. Shem Tob upon the Psalms, and Solomon Melech in loc. also Montanus and our Translators in the Margin, My Body was not bid; see also Muis in loc. It appears then, that very learned Men have thought with Dr. Hammond that מ"ע sometimes signifies a Body.

P. 272. in Rom. 8. 4.

Grotius in his Notes on Chap. 2. 26. interprets this word in a sense quite contrary to Dr. Hammond. The Apostle (says he) here explains what he means by וֹמָע, to wit מָעָא, which is usually rendered דָּסָא-מָא, not only by Interpreters, but also by Josephus, and properly signifies such things as are in their own nature just and good, as I have said on Luk. 1. 6. and in Lib. 1. c. 1. 9. de Jure B. and P. But they are both in an error; for, 1. The Distinction which the Rabbins make between מָעָא and מ"ע has no foundation either in their Etymology or Use. 2. The Greek word דָּסָא-מָא is used by
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by Greek Interpreters to signify the Divine Laws in general, and tho' they most commonly render כִּי by סְדוּקִים, yet they also use that word sometimes where the Hebrew has מִשְׁפַּת, see Deut. 30.19. 1 Kings 2.3. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvc.

Here omitting other things, I shall only enquire how our Monsieur proves that both Græcius and Dr. Hammond are in an error. His former proof cannot evince that Dr. Hammond is in an error, for he makes not any mention of that distinction of the Rabbins, and so, tho' we should grant it to be true, that their distinction has no foundation either in the Etymology or Use of the Words, it do's not affect him. As to the latter proof, our Monsieur seems to say therein the very same that Dr. Hammond do's: Do's our Monsieur say כִּי is most commonly rendered by סדוקים? So the Doctor says that סדוקים is answerable to the Hebrew כִּי. Do's our Monsieur say that סדוקים is used by Greek Interpreters to signify the Divine Laws in general? In like manner, says Dr. Hammond, סדוקים is any thing that God has thought meet to appoint and command his people, from סדוקים meet or right. Yea, our Monsieur seems to have
Inso (transcribed Dr. Hammond's Words) when he says, that God's Ordinances or Institutions of what sort soever they be are called "sanctuarum domini" (as it is justly added) to obey him. So that, if the Transcribing Dr. Hammond's Words, or the laying something in which the Doctor is not at all concern'd, be the proving that the Doctor is in an error, then our Monsieur has proved that he is, otherwise not.

Our Monsieur says that they most commonly render "sanctuarum domini" by sanctuarium, yet add, that they use also that word sometimes where the Hebrew has "miy," as Deut. 33:21,22, and 1 Kings 2:9. But perhaps he will not find in a very early blessed to prove, that the word answers therein in those places. As to Deut. 30:16, it is a mistake instead of Deut. 30:16, where in some Copies there is nothing at all that answers to "sanctuarum," and in the Alexandrian MS. it was differently read, and in the Codex. As to 1 Kings 2:9, according to the Ech, Compendium, the view answers there too of all other translations; Deu. 30:16. In Rom. 8:20.


Which, the Wiseman in Eccles. 13, and 29:10, calls "sanctuarum," and the Ech. 125:4, renders "sanctuarum." Therefore, we give (peace the
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The words "vain" and "labour" are not found either in Eccles. 1. 13, or 3. 10. The following words, *This fore travel hath God given, &c.* are in Eccles. 1. 13. But why our Monsieur should expound *fore travel* by *vain labour* as if the word either in the Hebrew or in the LXX did signify *Vain,* (which they do not) I cannot imagine.

He translates the Greek word χάσμα by labour, which in this place ought to have been rendered grief, for the Hebrew never signifies a labour. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Dr. Hammond had said that יָדו signifies χάσμα, labour; our Monsieur on the other hand says confidently that it never signifies labour. But it is not difficult to produce many places, in which our Translators and others render it Labour; *Thy labours be in the house of a stranger,* Prov. 5. 10. *In all labour,
118. Animadversions upon

labour, Prov. 14. 23. Exact all your labours, Isa. 58. 3. As our Translation, so also the Chaldee, Syriack, Arabick and Vulgar render it Labour or Labours, Prov. 5. 10. Montanus renders it so in Prov. 14. 23. and Isa. 58. 3. Tremellius renders it so in all the three places. In Prov. 5. 10. the LXX have ἑαυτοῦ, and the Latin Interpretation in our Polyglot renders ἑαυτοῦ by Labores, as Dr. Hammond doth.

P. 282. in Rom. 9. 15.

I have favoured him whom I will favour, I have had mercy on whom I will have mercy. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Our Monsieur here deals with Moses, as he doth with Dr. Hammond, viz. he misrepresents both his words and sense. In Exod. 33. 19. Moses's words are not הניטו and ידוהי (as our Monsieur represents them) but ידוהי and יתוהי, which are rightly rendered by the LXX, and the Apostle here following them, I will have mercy, and I will have compassion in the Future Tense (because of the conversivum) and in like manner by the Chaldee, Syriack and Arabick.
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Arabick, &c. In p. 284. towards the end of the Page, our Monsieur hath these words, 
Tho' the Hebrew word be of the preterperfect Tense, yet I have rendered it as if it was the Future; now if Exod. 9. 16. he rendered a word of the Preterperfect Tense as if it was the Future, he might rather have done so, Exod. 33. 19. where he hath the Apostles Authority to warrant him.

P. 285. in Rom. 9. 28.

They thought בִּלְחַה לָיִיָּו to signify an account. — The words הָרוֹם וַדַּלְחַה signify diligently and particularly cast up. — The Verb לָיָּו according to the use of the Chaldee, I render by to hasten. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

I am not of our Monsieur's opinion, that the LXX thought that בִּלְחַה and לָיָּו do signify an account. I grant that they have the word לָיָּו, but I. It is not necessary that לָיָּו here should signify an account; why may it not signify the word or the thing spoken? 2. How appears it that Isa. 10. 22. the LXX render בִּלְחַה by לָיָּו? I should rather say that they render it by לָיָּו פִּיו לָא, as Dan. 9. 27. they render בִּלְחַה by פִּיו לָא.

I 4
Animadversions upon

It is well known that the verb ἄρτος signifies to consummate or finish; and so in we may say that ἄρτος ὑπολαθή is put for the finishing the word or thing spoken of.

Our Monsieur should have directed us to some place of Scripture where ἄρτος signifies diligently and particularly to cast up, or where it refers to accounts. And as to the Greek word which the LXX use, viz. ἐπιρέω, our Monsieur durst not say that it signifies the same; but he says that it seems to signify so, and that only in part.

If any place of Scripture could be produced where ἄρτος hath the signification which our Monsieur mentions, I should approve of his interpretation of it, and render the last words of Isa. 10. 22. thus: He hastens the finishing the work, and cutting it short in righteousness.

P. 286. in Rom. 9. 33.

In Isa. 28. 16. God speaks thus; I say in Sion for a foundation, a Stone, an elect Stone; if we read ἁθορήθην εἰλίθ, for ἐδείκνυε a tower. He that believes shall not make haste; i.e. shall never be judged to have made too much haste in choosing it, nor ever be ashamed of his choice. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad.,
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Why must נֹּב be rendered a sower, Isa. 28. 16? It may perhaps have that signification elsewhere, and some may possibly translate it so in Isa. 28. 16, but others render נֹּב a tried stone (so the Vulgar and our own Translation) or lapidem probationis, as Tremellius, and it is known that the signification of the Verb נֹּב favours this, viz. to prove or try. Our Monseur is willing to read an elect stone, and to put נֹּב for נֹּב. And it is very true that the LXX in Isa. 28. 16, and S. Peter Epit. c. 2. vi 6. have the Epithet elect, but every one sees that נֹּב is too remote from נֹּב. Grotius therefore supposed that the LXX read נֹּב, but I should rather say that they read נֹּב, and took it for an Noun, for so it might be rendered lapidem electionis, or an elect stone. Yet, perhaps, there is no necessity of admitting any change at all, but we may retain נֹּב and yet render it elect; for as there is a very near affinity as to the letters in the words נֹּב and נֹּב, so they might agree in signification, and therefore the Syriack renders נֹּב by נֹּב, Isa. 28. 16. The Verb נֹּב might signify both Probare and Eligere, as נֹּב seems to signify both Eligere and Probare.

For
For every one that is lifted up on high shall be cast down; and he that is in the account will be cast down. The Lord knoweth the thoughts of man, that they are mortal; and that whether he be wise or fools, he hath no power nor wisdom tocourses. For he shall be cast down, though he be not the lowest among the low.
Dr. Hammond had said that according to the Hebrew Idiom אֲאָלְמָן (from אַלְמָן to be filled) is used for collecting or congregating. Our Monsieur denies that it is used so, appealing to the Lexicons, and so to the Lexicons he must go. אֲאָלְמָן Collectio, Isa. 31.4. Gen.48.19. Congregatio, Jer.12. thus Schmirer’s Lexicon. Collectio, Isa. 31. thus Munster’s, and that of David de Pomis. Congregatio, Isa. 31.4. Jer.12.6. So Pagnin’s and Dr. Castle’s. And long before them Kimchi in lib. Radic. makes it to signify Congregatio. These Lexicons and the Authors of them are such as our confident Appealers cannot except against, and they all give their Verdict against him and for Dr. Hammond.

P. 295. in Rom. 14. 15.

He had said afterwards that יִהְיֶה, which signifies destruction, and is often rendered אַרְדַּעַת, is in Prov. 31.6. rendered לִשׂנָה, or לִשׁנָה, just as if יִהְיֶה was a Noun, and in the place of Proverbs were not the Participle יִהְיֶה perishings, but a Noun. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Our Monsieur's expression (as Dr. Hammond) had said afterwards, is not easy to be understood. If having promised, that Dr. Hammond had first said so or so, he had then subjoined also, or had said afterwards, it had been intelligible enough, due to say: He had said afterwards, when nothing has gone before to which this expression can refer, is a way of speaking that I have not been acquainted with. Moreover, our Monsieur has not exactly translated Dr. Hammond's words, substituting in Latin, when Dr. Hammond hath said, as it is in the LXX, Prov. 31:6. But waving all this, I know not why our Monsieur should think it strange, this Dr. Hammond should take "7257, for a Noun," seeing so many learned Men have interpreted it as being a Noun, Num. 24:20, 24. as Montanus, Buxtorf, our English Translators in the Margin, the Author of the Arabic Version, Münster, R. Jacob, the Son of Eleazar ap. Kimchi, in his Raph. &c. As to "7257, Prov. 31:6, Dr. Hammond do's not say; and we may be sure that he never thought that it is not a Participle, nor had our Monsieur the least ground to surmise the contrary. If the Doctor had said that
that ἔρχεται is rendered ἐρχέται by the LXX; we might have thought he took it for a Noun; but he tells us quite otherwise, that the LXX rendered it by δὴ in (οὐκ οὐδὲ), and gathers thence that ἔρχεται may answer to ἔρχω of the Noun. But, however, you are not well told of this. The Septuagint for ὑπὸ (for an ensign, read or thought it ought to be read ὑπὸ ἐπὶ for a Prince, by which the sense is not much altered, because the same person that was to be a Prince, was also to form an Ensign. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc would have it. But its correction is, to the utmost, but surprising. And Dr. Hammond makes as much ado about it as if he were the first who ever thought about it. Here then, Monsieur must quarrel with Dr. Hammond, the as to the main, they say, the same thing. He says, that the same person that must be a Prince, was to form an Ensign; and Dr. Hammond says so, only in words. They differ, a little in assigning the reason, why the LXX rendered it so. Dr. Hammond says, because this being for an Ensign, is in effect all exceeding Titles; our Monsieur says, because they read, or thought it ought to be read ὑπὸ ἐπὶ. But I cannot but dissent from our Monsieur in this. Because, ἔρχεται (as every one must
acknowledge) is too remote from שׁוֹלֵם.

2. Because there is no necessity of admitting any change, or that the LXX should read otherwise than we do. To shew this, I shall transcribe part of that which I wrote long since in my Conjectanea in Isa.9.1,2, &c. in defence of the LXX against Bootius, who in his Animadvers. lib. 1. c. 5. &c. falls foul upon them for rendring שׁוֹלֵם by to rule. At שׁוֹלֵם (inquit Bootius) nullo modo a quo aut quicum quam simile significatus. Faterur interim quod שׁוֹלֵם est אָרָךְ Princeps, & quod אָרָךְ inter dum scribitur etiam בָּשָׂם & הָיָה; faterur itidem quod Kinchi significationem verbi אָרָךְ facit esse affine & quodammodo germanam חָוָה, & utrique tribuit notionem Elaticonis seu Exaltationis; fatetur denique quod Aben Ezra, Sol. Jarchi, S. Hieron. & recentiores fere omnes eandem significationem attribuunt verbo בָּשָׂם; quæ omnia mihi videntur non parum momenti habere ut persuadam, quod שׁוֹלֵם olim habuit significationem Principatus seue אָרָךְ. I do not see why any should think it strange that the LXX should render שׁוֹלֵם to rule, Isa.11.10. or fancy that they read שׁוֹלֵם instead of שׁוֹלֵם, which hath the same signification; and therefore the Chaldee renders שׁוֹלֵם by שׁוֹלֵם.
P. 313. in 1 Cor. 5. 10.

The Hebrew ד日々 does not signify Violence, but Injury; and because he was corrupted signifies any change whatsoever for the worse, and not only Lusts, as any Lexicon will shew. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadu.

Here our Monsieur appeals again to the Lexicons, and so must stand or fall by them. He pronounces confidently that ד日々 does not signify Violence; and yet the Lexicons say ד日々 Vis, violentia, rapina, see Buxtorf, Schindler, Dr. Castle, Mercer, Forster, Reuchlin, David de Pomis, &c. Also our Monsieur renders ד日々 he was corrupted, and I would know which of our Lexicons taught him to translate it so. It is ד日々 which they render Corruptus fuit, and so in Gen. 6. 11. (the place to which our Monsieur refers) the word is ד日々 in Niphal; as to ד日々 they render it (not corrupti, but) corruptere.

P. 316. in 1 Cor. 5. 10.

The Hebrew word ד日々 signifies Dung properly. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Perhaps there is not the word דש in all the Bible, דש there is which is rendered Dispitercorei; but it is דש which signifies Dung.

P. 317. in 1 Cor. 5. 10. Note i.

Our Author had not look'd into 1 Kings 23:7: for the word there in the Hebrew is נְשֶׁר, that is in a Grove, not נְשֶׁר, which has a different signification. But he was deceived by an overhasty reading of what Mr. Selden says about this matter de Dies Syris Synt. 2, cap. 2. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

Our Monsieur would persuade his Reader that Dr. Hammond had made the Hebrew word in 2 Kings 23:7. to be נְשֶׁר, but he who consults the Doctor will find that he do's not as much as mention that word. It is true, that in the Doctor's Annotation there is the word אֶשֶרְתֹּת, which by the Printer's fault is (as I suppose) put for אֶשֶרְתֹּת, which is the Plural of אֶשֶּׁרְתֹּת, the word used 2 Kings 23:7. Astarte might come from either the Singular or the Plural,
Plural, but in the Chaldee Paraphrase upon that Text אֹסְרָוָת answers to the Hebrew אַשְׁרֵא, and is nearer to אַשְׁרָתו than it is, or any other word that I know of. I add, that Dr. Hammond may be fairly defended without imputing any fault to the Printer; for he is not the first that hath thought that Groves might have the name of Ἀσθερόθ or Ἀσταροθ, for Procopius Ga-
zaus upon this very place, 2 Kings 23. 7. where the LXX render הָרְשִׁי by τῷ ἀλοι to the Grove, hath these words τῷ ἀλοι ὑ Ἀσπαρά ἐρμανεῦσι; and likewise upon 2 Kings 17. 10. where the LXX render ὁ ἄστρον by ἀλοι Groves, he says thus, παναχε τῷ ἀλοι ὑ Ἀσπαρά ἐρμανεῦσι.

Our Monsieur adds, that Dr. Hammond was deceived by an over-hasty reading of Mr. Selden; but, 1. Our Monsieur hath not proved that Dr. Hammond was deceived. 2. I am apt to think that our Monsieur was deceived by over-hasty reading of Mr. Sel-
den, and that being told by him that was by some translated In Luco 2 Chron. 15. 16. he likewise renders it In a Grove, 2 Kings 23. 7. Whereas he might have seen that Mr. Selden did not approve that inter-
pretation, but prefer'd that of the LXX and Kimchi's: See him de Diis Syris Syn-
tag. 2. cap. 2.
P. 319. in 1 Cor. 5. 12, 13.

The Syriack Interpreter has left out in the 12th Verse ρελ and κει, and ρελ again in the 13th, because he did not see how the Apostle's words could otherwise be made to hang together. The Latin also, and the Arabian Interpreters omit the Particle ρελ in both Verses. The Ἑθιοπικὸν departs yet further from the rest, who has &c eum qui intus homines judicabit. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadversion.

The Syriack Interpreter has not left out ρελ in the 13th Verse. Our Monsieur suffer'd himself to be impos'd upon by the Latin Translation, which has Tollite autem; whereas if the Translators had rendred word for word out of the Syriack, they would have said Et tollite. But if Men trust to Translations, as our Monsieur doth, it is no wonder if they be deceived. It is true that the Syriack has omitted ρελ in the 12th Verse, but not for the reason which our Monsieur gives (for the sense had been current enough if he had not omitted it) but for the reason which the Latin and Arabick Interpreters had to leave it out in both Verses, viz. because in the Copies which they
they had before them χριστός was wanting in both Verses. Thus in the Alexandrian MS. it is omitted both in the 12th and the 13th Verse, and in some other Copies in the 13th Verse. As to χριστός, I cannot say that the Syriack Interpreter did omit it, he rather turn'd it into ὁ θεός, and did not read the latter part of the 12th Verse by way of Interrogation as the Greek doth. But our Monsieur tells us the strangest News concerning the Ἑθιοπικ Interpreter, viz. that v. 13. he translates thus, *Et eum qui intus homines judicabit.* I cannot imagine what it should be that betray'd him to so gross a mistake; for not only the Ἑθιοπικ Version itself, but also the Latin Translation of it in our Polyglot hath *Et eum qui intus est Dominus judicabit eum.*

P. 323. in 1 Cor. 7. 34.

*His Citation out of the Jerusalem Paraphrase makes nothing to the purpose, it being manifest that those words signify distrust or unbelief, not cares or distractions. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.*

*Animad*.

Our Monsieur do's not inform us what the words are that signify so, but leaves us to
to find them in the Jerusalem Targum our selves. In Gen. 22. 14. the word is חולם, and in Gen. 45. 26. it is חלומין now I appeal to any one, yea even to our Monsieur himself, (if he know any thing of the Hebrew or Chaldee) whether these words do signify Distrest or Unbelief (as our Monsieur confidently affirms that they do) and whether Dr. Hammond did not rightly render them Division and Divided.

P. 339. in 1 Cor. 11. 7.

Δοξα Kupis is used by the Septuagint for תמרנה, or that Symbolical Likeness of God which appeared in the Tabernacle. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc:

Animadv.

Δοξα (not Δοξα Kupis) is by the LXX used for חלומין Numb. 12. 8. and Psal. 17. 15. the places mention’d by Dr. Hammond; but that in those places signifies the Symbolical Likeness of God which appeared in the Tabernacle, we shall not believe upon our Monsieur’s bare word. It is expected therefore that he should prove it, if he would have it believed.

P. 344.
P. 344. in 1 Cor. 11. 29.

The Hebrew כִּי in the Book of Joshua manifestly signifies to consecrate, the discourse being about places of Refuge, which were esteemed Sacred. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt,

Here our Monsieur do's that which is very rare with him, i.e. he gives a reason of his assertion. But his reason (viz. that the discourse is about places of Refuge) makes as much for the other signification which Dr. Hammond mentions, viz. that of discriminating, as it do's for this of consecrating; for places of Refuge are discriminated, separated or set apart, as well as esteem'd sacred. And therefore the LXX Josb. 20. 7. render כִּי by διακόπτω discriminavit, and the Syriack by יָשָׁר separavunt.

P. 367. in 2 Cor. 1. 11.

It is certain כִּי often signifies from, as Chr. Noldius in Conc. Particularum has observed. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc..
Our Monsieur here could not content himself with saying that לֹא often signifies from, but he tells us that it is certain; and yet all this Certainty is built upon the sole authority of Noldius, as (says he) Chr. Noldius has observed; he do’s not say as Chr. Noldius has proved, which would have signified something. But they that examine the Texts produced by Noldius will find, that in them לֹא hath its usual Signification From the face.

P. 448. in Phil. 11.

これ was the name only of the Officers that attended upon Magistrates, or certain publick Criers. See my Note on Exod. ver. 8. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

When our Monsieur says that it was the name of the Officer that attended upon Magistrates, he much agrees with Dr. Hammond who makes them to have been Officers that attended the Judges in every City, alledging Deut. 16. 18. But when he says that these Shoterim were certain pub-
lick Criers, he should not have expected
that we should believe this without proof,
nor should we have had such a blind di-
rection as this: See my Note on Exod.
ver. 8. Such a blind reference in Dr. Ham-
mond would have had a severe repre-
hension.

P. 439. in Ephes. 5. 32.

He (i.e. Munster) did not render the He-
brew words, which seem to be corrupt; but
they are rendred by Camero, after premising
that he took them from Munster thus, Ad
significandum conjugium viri superni qui
benedictus est, To signify the Marriage of
the Man on High who is blessed. And so
they are rendred by Grotius. But דָּאָר is
not Vir, but Homo; besides, what is the
meaning of לָּה? Should it be read לָה to
thee? What can be the sense of these words,
The most High Adam shall be blessed? Thus
Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

It is most certain that the Hebrew
words, as they are here set down by our
Monsieur, are corrupted, viz. by himself;
for they differ much from the words
which we have in Munster and Camera.
Our Monsieur represents them thus, היעלינו יhiro כך האשם וגו. So that our Monsieur not only inverts the Order of the words, and sets those first which in Munster and Camero are last, but he also substitutes לנה קרמו instead of לנה קרמו, and instead of לנה. He would also persuade us that Grotius renders the Hebrew words as Camero doth, whereas he that compares them will see that Camero hath Viri superni, when Grotius hath Viri supremi. He asks what the sense can be of these words, The most High Adam shall be blessed. To which I answer I know not, neither do I desire to know; but the words of Camero whereby he renders Munster’s Hebrew, viz. To signify the Marriage of the Man from on high who is blessed, may have a good sense. I only add, that perhaps the words may be interpreted thus, To signify the Marriage of Man to the most High who is blessed, or shall be blessed, i.e., for ever; but I determine nothing.

P. 479. in 1 Thess. 1. 3.

The Arabick and the Syriack seem to have omitted these words ימ Levitra צא וב, because they could not connect them with the foregoing. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
It is false that either the Arabick or the Syriack omits those words, but the former hath them near the end of the Verse, the latter near the beginning of it, as our Polyglot shews.

P. 483. in 1 Thess. 4. 4.

What our Author says here out of Barnabas and the Jews, he took from Grotius, except the Interpretation he gives of the word בְּקֵז, which never signified an Instrument, but only a Cup: Nor is there any such affinity, as he contends between that word and the Greek ὀξεῖος, either in sound or signification. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Our Monsieur should not have excepted Dr. Hammond's interpretation of the word בְּקֵז, for Grotius makes it to signify an Instrument, as much as Dr. Hammond doth. His Words are these, R. Akiba corpus vocat בְּקֵז, nimirum corpus instrumentum est animi. But let these two Great Men say what they will, our Monsieur afferts very confidently that it never signified an Instrument,
ment, but only a Cup. Yet notwithstanding all this assurance, it is certainly false that דל signifies only a Cup. It is certain that in sundry places of Scripture it signifies a sort of Fowl or Bird, see Levit. 11.17. Deut. 14.16. Psal. 102.7. and R. Nathan in Concord. makes it to signify not only a Cup, but also דל_in a Lot. But should we grant (which we do not) that this is the only signification of the word in Scripture, it would not help our Monsieur at all, for a Jewish Writer is alleged here; and therefore if the Jewish Writers use it to signify other things (and not only a Cup) what becomes of our Monsieur’s confident assertion? And that with them it doth signify other things, as Porus in quo pilis nascentur, &c. our Monsieur may see in Buxtort Lex. Chald. Dr. Castle, &c. As to the Greek word αἰεός, Dr. Hammond had said, that if we take away the first σ, it is very near to דל; and this also displeases our Monsieur, who denies that there is any such affinity between the words either in sound or signification, as Dr. Hammond contends for; but certainly there is a near affinity in respect of their signification, the one signifying a Cup, the other a Vessel; and Dr. Hammond doth not pretend that there is any affinity as to sound, unless you take away the former σ.
P. 543. in Heb. 5. 7.

This will not appear to any that look into the place, yea they that consult it will see, that Dr. Hammond's interpretation is more probable than the Monsieur's. Dr. Hammond makes to signify the object of that people's fear, the terrible thing which they dreaded, and not fear itself, i.e. the passion of fear. For this Exposition he offers these two Reasons: 1. Fear itself (says he) is ריא. 2. It follows in that very place, The Lord shall be thy fear, i.e. surely the object of it, he shall be feared by thee. This is a competent proof of the truth and fitness of the Doctor's interpretation, and according to it the sense is very clear, Fear not their fear; i.e. Let not the things which they fear be the object of yours, but let the Lord be the object of it. The places alleged by Dr. Hammond immediately after do further confirm his interpretation of Isa. 8. 12.
8. 12, viz. 26. 8. and 34. 12. in which the word מִרְאָה is rendred terribleness or terror; and nothing could have been produced more fitly for confirmation of that which he saith in general, that fear in Scripture sometimes signifies the object of fear, the truth of which our Monsieur at last is forc’d to confess. This and more may be saied in favour of the Doctor’s Exposition. Come we now to our Monsieur’s, which is that מִרְאָה here (viz. Isa. 8. 12.) signifies that which fears, an Exposition that could never have entred into the thoughts of any Man besides our Monsieur. Will it not be excellent sense, Fear not him that fears? And yet he hath the confidence to conclude thus, As will appear to any that look into the place.

I cannot but obverse here, that in Dr. Hammond, near the beginning of this Note in Heb. 5. 7. we have these words מִרְאָה from אֶרֶץ is rendred ἐνλαβέων, Exod. 3. 6. To which our Monsieur, immediately before that which is saide of the words of Isaiah, says, But it is the Root itself which is us’d in that place. And then he insults over the Doctor, as his manner is: It is strange (says he) our learned Author should sometimes cite places of Scripture upon trust. But I am confident that Dr. Hammond writ thus, So מִרְאָה from אֶרֶץ timuit, which is ren-
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rendred in the LXX Exod. 3. 6. By negligence of the Transcriber or Printer the Relative which might easily be omitted.

P. 511. in 1 Tim. 1. 18.

In Numb. 4. 3. the word מנה must not be rendered into the Host, but into the Troop or Company, as I have shewn in that place. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadw.

Dr. Hammond here mentions two renderings of Numb. 4. 3. we may either read thus, All that enter into the army or host, or with the LXX All that enter λειπργίν, to officiate; the former of which our Monsieur will by no means allow, saying very magisterially that it must not be rendered into the host, tho' he gives no reason why it must not, but would persuade us that he hath shewn it otherwhere. But I ask, Hath he shew'd that מנה doth not signify an Host, or on the other hand that it doth signify a Troop or Company? I believe that he hath shew'd neither of these. My reason is, because in the words that follow those which I transcrib'd, he says, that a Troop or Company of men is so called (i.e. בונים) because any Company of Men march-
Animadversions upon

marching in order is in some respect like an Army. So that he grants that נר signifies not a Troop or Company, but an Army; yet it must be rendered a Troop or Company according to him, because that somewhat resembles an Army.

P. 554. in Heb. 8. 9.

גבע and ביה are one and the same Root, but differently written; the Letters of the Organ in the Eastern Languages, and especially the Guttural, being very often confounded. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

By this reason ביה and גבע will all three be one and the same Root, and so will ביה and גאע are all four one and the same Root, and the same may be said of all the Words, in which one Radical Letter is a Guttural (let it be the first Radical Letter, or the second, or the third) and the other two Radical Letters are the same; they are all one and the same Root according to the new Ars Critica.

P. 554.
P. 554. in Heb. 8. 9.

I wonder our learned Author thought, that the LXX pointed otherwise the word נלמאנה for Melamedah is of the Feminine Gender, and cannot be joyn’d with what goes before. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Why cannot the Feminine Melamedah be joyn’d with that which goes before? Is not אֶרֶם or רחַי in רַחְיָה of the Feminine Gender? Perhaps our Monsieur took רחַי י to be the Infinitive Mood, for he renders it by יָד מֵעִי, but if any have taken it so before him (which I question) it is certain that there is no necessity that we should take it so, as it is evident that Montanus look’d upon it as a Noun, and so did Dr. Hammond. I only add, that the Chaldee and Syriack do manifestly translate it as a Noun.

P. 554. in Heb. 8. 9.

Our Author mis-translates לְשׁוֹן by I have given or sent. He confounds this Verb with מעָשָׁא. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Our Monsieur here, according to his accustomed manner, misrepresents Dr. Hammond, who could not translate \( I \) have given or sent, it being of the Future Tense. That which the Doctor says is, that the LXX render \( \\מֵאָסַר \) by \( יָדְעָתָה \), And I gave or sent.

P. 570. in Heb. 13. 15.

The same Interpreters render the Verb \( לְאַכְלָה \) to eat \( \\אָכַל \) in Josh. 5. 12. So also they render the Verb \( לְצַחֲת \) to burn, Deut. 26. 12. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. But those Interpreters (viz. the LXX) neither render \( לְאַכְלָה \) by \( \\אָכַל \) Josh. 5. 12. nor \( לְצַחֲת \) by it, Deut. 26. 12. In Deut. 26. 12. there is not the word \( לְצַחֲת \), it is by mistake put for Deut. 26. 14. where \( לְצַחֲת \) is by the LXX rendred \( \\אָכַל \); but how comes our Monsieur to render \( לְצַחֲת \) in that place to burn? I know that it is frequently us’d in that signification, but here our Translators have rendred it to take away, and with them not only Montanus,
tanus, Tremellius, &c. but also Onkelos, and v. 13. not only Onkelos with Tremellius and Montanus, but also the LXX and Vulgar translate it after the same manner. But I have not found any that render it to burn, in either of the Verses. As to Josh. 5. 12. the LXX render ייוסהל משבושה by ἐναρποῦν ἐς, and therefore it is a very gross mistake which our Monsieur is guilty of in saying that they there render ἐναρποῦν by ἐκαπτών.

P. 591. in 1 Pet. 3. 15.

Ἀγάζει Θεῷ in τὰς κατάλοις ὑμῶν, i.e. know that God is holy or a lover of Sanctity. For this is often the signification of the Hebrew Conjugation Hiphil שִּׁירָה, which is ordinarily rendred ἢγάζεω. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

This seems to be a new discovery, that the Conjugation Hiphil often signifies, To know a thing to be so, and therefore our Monsieur ought to have given some instances of it. Perhaps it may be said that our Monsieur intends no more than that שִּׁירָה which is of that Conjugation (when the Speech is of God) signifies To know that he is holy; but suppose this, he ought still to have directed us to some places of Sacred
Sacred Writ, where it signifies this, and not have expected that we should believe it upon his bare affirmation. Our Monseur here refers us to his Notes on Gen. 2. 3. but if I could expect that my advice would be follow'd, I should wish the Reader, that desires to be rightly inform'd of the meaning of this expression, To sanctify God, to peruse our Mr. Mede's Discourse upon S. Matth. 6. 9.

P. 592. in 1 Pet. 3. 12.

[17] cannot by any means be deduced from [15], which signifies a sheath. It should be read jindon to be deduced from the Root [15], which Dr. Hammond do's not seem to have observed. Thus Monseur Le Clerc.

Animadu:

It is most true that Dr. Hammond did not observe it, and I add that none but such an Hebrician as our Monseur is, would have observed it, for it is utterly false. It is true, if [15] was a perfect Verb, or of necessity to be declined as a perfect Verb, it might make jindon in the Future Tense. But our Monseur might easily have known, and observed that it is a Verb Defective
Defective, and declined after ו"י. For this we have the authority of an excellent Critick and incomparable Grammarian, viz. Kimchi, who in his Radices says expressly that יי"י is in the form of ו"י. Therefore our Monsieur hath great cause to complain of his Grammar and Criticism, which did here wholly forsake their Master; and to say as it is in the Poet.

\textit{Desituo prudens artis ab arte mea.}

I cannot but also observe, that though Dr. Hammond hath taken so much pains to make it probable that ו"י Gen. 6:3. is deduced from יי, our Monsieur offers no answer to any thing which he says; and yet concludes most peremptorily, that it cannot by any means be deduced from it.

By this time, I suppose it sufficiently appears how great a Critick our Monsieur is in the Hebrew and other Oriental Languages, and I have some reason to believe, that upon a diligent and strict Examination he would be found not to be much better Judge of the Greek or Latin Tongue.
SECTION IV.

Of Monsieur Le Clerc's Skill in Chronology.

There being in our Monsieur's Reflections several Things interspers'd which relate to Chronology, I shall in the next place take a survey of them, that we may better judge whether he be a greater Critick in matters of Chronology, then he is found to be in the Oriental Languages.

P. 128. in S. Luk. 2. 8.

From the Shepherds having spent the night abroad in the open Fields it cannot be inferr'd, that the Birth of Christ was not in December, as G. J. Vossius has very well shown in a small Treatise de nat. Christi. But the Ancients however not agreeing in their Opinions about the day, nor so much as the year in which Christ was born, one might be ready perhaps to question the authority of Justin Martyr and Tertullian, who tell us that the Tables on which this enrolling here spoken of was made, were extant in their time. For from those Records this whole matter might easily have been
been known, and it would have been an in-
excusable neglect in the Christians of that
Age, who could have looked into those pub-
liek Registers, and transmitted to posterity
what they had there read, and yet would
not do it. But I am afraid that Tertul-
lian and others spoke only by guess, because
it was not certainly known that those Re-
cords were lost. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Here our Monsieur hath well observed,
that Vossius has very well shewn, that from
the Shepherds having spent the night abroad
in the open field, it cannot be inferr'd that
the Birth of Christ was not in December.
But he might also have observed that
Mr. Selden in a small Treatise concerning
the Birth of our Saviour has very well
shew'd, that from the different opinions
of some Ancients about the day of his
Birth; it cannot be inferr'd that it was not
on the 25th of December. They that
would be satisfied as to this matter may
peruse that excellent Treatise. But our
Monsieur only upon the account of those
different opinions will question the truth
of that which Justin and Tertullian say, that
the Tables in which our Saviour was en-
roll'd were extant in their time; and would
persuade us that they spake only by guess, which certainly must seem most strange to any unprejudiced person. For who can think that Justin Martyr, or any man in his Wits, would in an Apology for the Christians to the Emperor appeal to these casual Tables, and tell him that he might by consulting them satisfy himself of the Birth of Christ, if he could say only by guess, and was not certain, that they were extant at that time, and might be consulted. And so, would Tertullian have said positively, Quos testes fidelissimos Dominica nativitatis Romana Archiva custodiant con. Marcion. I. 4. c. 7. and Apud quos gentes eius inquirere potuissent, c. 19. if he had not known certainly that they were then kept in the Archives? But (sais our Monsieur) if these Tables were then extant, how came it that the Ancients did not agree in their opinions about the day and year of our Saviour's Birth? for (sais he) the whole matter might have been easily known by them. To which I answer, If in the time of Justin Martyr and Tertullian there had been such a Controversy about the day of our blessed Saviour's Nativity, as there was about the observation of Easter, it had been an irreconcilable neglect in the Christians of that Age not to consult these Records by which the matter might have been.
been decided, but our Monsieur surely will not pretend that in their time there was any such controversy about the day of Christ’s Birth, as there was about Easter. 2. I believe that our Monsieur cannot prove that there were any different Opinions about the day of our Saviour’s Nativity in Justin Martyr’s time, as I believe also that it will not be easily proved that there were any in Tertullian’s time. Some may possibly alledge Clemens Alexand. Strom. i. who speaks of some who refer’d the Birth of Christ to the 28th year of Augustus, and the 25th day of the month Pachon; so that these differ’d in Opinion from Tertullian as to the year of our Lord’s Nativity, and from those that refer’d it to the 25th of December as to the day. But upon a due Examination this Testimony out of Clemens Alexand. will be found not to have so much force to prove that they differ’d in Opinion about the Day and Year of Christ’s Nativity, as it may seem to have at the first Sight. I shall begin with the Year.

These of whom Clemens Alexand. speaks, refer’d our Lord’s Birth to the 28th year of Augustus, and therefore they differ’d from Tertullian himself, who con. Judaeos c. 8. refers it to the 41st year of Augustus.
mortem Cleopatra imperavit, are not his, or finally with Hier., we must read not quo post mortem Cleopatra imperavit, but qui post mortem Cleopatra imperavit, which Reading see in S. Hier. on Daniel 6, 2. ver. 59. For in the words immediately following he says, that Augustus lived after the Birth of Christ 15 Years, but if Christ was born in the 41st year after Cleopatra's death, according to Tertullian, Augustus lived but two Years after our Saviour's Birth. For Tertullian having said that Cleopatra can regnavit Augusto annis: 13 addes post Cleopatra Augustus aliis: aliis: 43. Now if Augustus reigned but 43 Years after the death of Cleopatra, then if our Saviour's Birth was in the 41st year after her Death, Augustus did not live 15, but only two Years after the Birth of Christ. Again Tertullian says, that all the Years of Augustus's Reina were 56, viz. 13, before the death of Cleopatra, and 43 after it, now if out of 56 Years we take the 15 Years after our Saviour's Birth, we know what remains, and that our Lord was born in the 41st year of Augustus's whole Reina according to Tertullian. I conclude therefore that our Monsieur cannot prove that there were different Opinions as to the Year of Christ's Nativity either in Justin Martyr's, or in Tertullian's time; for tho'
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Some in Clemens Alexand. say that our Saviour was born in the 28th of Augustus, and Tertullian refers his Birth to the 41st of the same Augustus, yet they do not differ, because the 28th year of that Emperor, according to the Egyptian Account, is the same with his 41st, according to Tertullian's.

As to the Birth-day of our Saviour, it is allledged that some who are mention'd by Clemens Alex. said that it was the 25th of the Egyptian Month Pachon, and so were of a different opinion from those who suppos'd that it was the 25th of December. Hervart in Chronolog. c. 247. p. 228. obh serving that Jos. Scaliger laid great stress upon this Testimony out of Clemens Alex. wherein the 25th of Pachon is assign'd as the day, answers briefly thus: Quasi vero

Ægyptius mensis Pachon non sit nonus mensis Egyptiorum a primo Egyptio mense Thoth, porinde atque December ab Aprili. This Answer of his Mr. Selden explains alledgeing that the Greek Fathers frequently took April for the first Month of the Year instead of March, as (says he) we see expressly in St. ChrysoStome, in Anastasius Patriarch of Antioch, in the Constitutions, attributed to the Apostles, in Macarius, Stephaniae, Gobanid, etc., and also they bad
had the very day of this Birth known by the name of the 25th of the 9th Month December. If then (says he) the Tradition was delivered thus, On the 25th Day of the 9th Month without superadding the name of the Month, some by mistake instead of the 25th of the 9th Month in the Roman Year placed it on the 24th of the 9th Month in the Egyptian Year, viz. Pachon. They that please may see this answer more at large in Mr. Selden himself in his Tract of the Birth-day of our Saviour, Sect. 8.

Perhaps that which Hervart and Mr. Selden say concerning April's being taken for the first Month may seem strange to some, but Jof. Scaliger de Emend. Temp. l. 6. p. 545. juxta. Edit. Colon. A.D. 1629, having alleged the words of Anastasius, Patriarch of Antioch, adds, Ubi passim notandum, Aprilis esse primum mensem, non Martium; item Octobrem septimum, non autem Septembruem. Sic apud Gregorium Turonensem mensis octauus est November, non October, so that it was not at all strange to him.

But because some may not be satisfied with these Answers to the Testimony out of Clemens Alex. but think still that those of whom he speaks did really differ in opinion from Tertullian as to the Year, and from both him and others as to the day of
the Birth of the Holy Jesus. I add, that their opinion (if we suppose it to have been different) seems not to have prevailed, and therefore we hear no more of it; and as Clemens Alexand. himself does not express his approbation of it, so it is very probable that they were very few that did approve or follow it, and consequently there was no necessity of sending from Egypt to Rome to consult the Tables or Records.

Finally S. Chrysostom's Homily de die Nativit. Christi. so clears this whole matter, that, if our Monsieur would have taken the pains to read it, he would not have reflected upon Justin Martyr and Tertullian so rudely as he hath done. In that Father's time many were unsatisfied about the day of our Lord's Nativity, and there was much disputation about it, till they sent to Rome, and received thence a certain and satisfactory account of it. For ancient Books (τοις ἀρχικοῖς καθφύγεται are S. Chrysostom's words) were kept at Rome, by consulting which they that pleas'd might have exact knowledge of the time of the Taxing. Thus S. Chrysostom. Now if these ancient Books or Records were kept at Rome in that Father's time, we cannot question their being extant in the time of Justin Martyr and Tertullian, who lived so many Years
Years before S. Chrysostom. And as upon occasion of the disputes about the day that were in S. Chrysostom's time, they sent to Rome to be certainly informed about it; so, if there had been the like occasion, they would have sent, in the time of Justin and Tertullian. And finally as it is evident that S. Chrysostom spoke not only by guess, so we may fully assure our selves that Justin and Tertullian who were some time at Rome had certain knowledge of that which they said of the Tables and Records, that they were then extant. Thus it appears every way how vain our Montfau is in his reflections upon those very ancient and learned Writers.

I know that there is an Argument which Jos. Scaliger rely'd so much upon, that he contend'd that which was recorded in those ancient Books, or Tables of which those Primitive Writers make mention, and was for fixing the time of our Lord's Birth about the end of September, or beginning of October. See him in Notis, in Fragmenta, in fin. & in Canon. Isagoge 1. 3. f. 102. It is drawn from Zacharias's ministryng in the Course of Abia. But it is so largely answer'd by Mr. Selden in his Treatise concerning the Birth-day of our Saviour, Sect. 8, that I shall not need to say any thing to it. They that please may also see what others, particularly
larly Petavius de Doct. Temp. 1. 12. c. 7, and the Author of the Tract intituled, Christ's Birth not mis-timed, have answer'd to it. I have not seen the latter of these, but Dr. Hammond in the last of his Six Quæries, §. 36, makes mention of it in these words: That argument drawn by some from the courses of the Priests, is in a little Tract intituled Christ's Birth not mis-timed, evidently demonstrated by a very worthy and ingenuous person to be a meer deceit. And indeed every one may see that it is built upon meer conjectures; tho' Scaliger would have them pass for no less than Demonstrations, mere demonstrationes, quibus contra-
dicis non potest; so he in Notis in Fragmenta. And so in his Canon, Isag. l. 3. §. 102. Tempus, quod vero proximum est, certissime designari potest, quia est demonstrativum; nisi quis dubitare velit aut de epocha Hebd-
madis Abie, quod est pertinaciae, aut de ver-
bis Evangelistæ, quod est impietatis. But as we most firmly believe the Evangelists' words, and so are not guilty of impiety; so we doubt of the Epocha Hebdombadum Abie, and yet ought not to be charged with pertinacy, because we have the great-
est reason to doubt of it. I shall add Scal-
iger's words in his Animadversions on Eu-
fæbus, Numb. 2016, which also shew how much he was enamoured with this fancy of
of his Reliquae, quæ pertinent ad Ephemeriam Abiae, & conceptionem Johannis, & natalem Salvatoris; habes plene in appendice operis de Emend. Temp. item in Canon: Isagog. quæ studiosus, si non est hebes, nunquam sine fructu, si non est malignus, nunquam sine voluptate leget. But what pleasure can it be to any serious person to see so great a man so fondly in love with his own Notions? I only add, that Mr. Lydiat de Emendat. Tempor. p. 157. hath also noted the weakness of Scaliger’s Argument from the Courses of the Priests; and that Spanhemius in Dubiis Evangel. part 2. Dub. 12, 13, 14, 15. f. 11. hath briefly, but fully shew’d, that the grounds of his opinion, which he will have to be mere demonstrationes, are indeed meer conjectures or supposals: He also tells us that Kepler shews, that from the Courses of the Priests it may as well be proved, that our Lord’s Birth was on the 25th of December, and Petavius Doctr. Temp. l. 12. c. 7. shews the same.

Having said this of Scaliger’s Argument, it will not be amiss to consider briefly that which Dr. Lightfoot urges, to prove, that Christ was born in the Month of Tisri, which (says he) answereth to part of our September. It is this, If Christ lived just two and thirty years and an half, and died at
at Easter, it must needs follow that he was born about the middle of the Month Tisri: see his Harmony of the Evangelists in S. Luk. 2. 7. He says, that the time that Christ lived here upon the Earth was two and thirty years and a half exactly. But how proves he that he lived exactly so many? He did not surely design to prove it by that which immediately follows, So long did David reign in Jerusalem, 2 Sam. 5. 4, 5. for there is no necessity that Christ should live just so many years here on Earth as David reign’d in Jerusalem; and withal, the sacred Text says, that David reign’d three and thirty years in Jerusalem. In Hebron he reign’d seven years and six months, and in Jerusalem thirty three years, 2 Sam. 5. 5; and so it is most true that he reign’d forty years, v. 4. for it seems he reign’d somewhat more than forty.

Dr. Lightfoot’s proof then follows, which is this, That Christ lived nine and twenty years before he was baptized, and three years and an half from his baptism to his death. The former he would prove from S. Luke 3. 23. where (says he) it is said that he began to be thirty, or entred upon his thirtieth year at his Baptism. But S. Luke doth not say that he began to be thirty, but to be about thirty years of age; so that he did not think it necessary to set down his Age exactly,
exactly, and then how can Dr. *Lightfoot* say that he was exactly of the Age of twenty nine years? Besides, Expositors and Chronologers differ very much in interpreting the Text, and so in assigning the Age of our Saviour at the time of his Baptism, as is shew'd by *Seneschal, Quest. 2. cap. 7.* and others. And finally, if any one will consult *Grotius* upon that Text, and see what he says to prove that Christ was of the Age of thirty years compleat, or something above it, he will not think the time ill spent.

Dr. *Lightfoot* is not more happy in proving that Christ lived just three years and an half after his Baptism. 1. He alleges *Dan. 9. 27.* *In half that week shall he cause sacrifice and oblation to cease.* 2. He says that the foresaid number of years is plainly parcel'd out by *Passovers,* &c. But to the first I say, not only that sundry Christian Interpreters expound those words *Dan. 9,* otherwise than Dr. *Lightfoot* doth, but also that we need not take *Half the week* so strictly as to denote exactly and precisely the half. To the second I say, that nothing is more uncertain than the number of the *Passovers;* some say that he kept only three *Passovers,* some four, some five, to omit those that will not grant that there were so many as three *Passovers* between Christ's Baptism and Death.

It
It appears then, that Dr. Lightfoot hath not proved the Particulars, which he lays down as the ground of his opinion.


It is highly probable that there was a considerable interval of time between Pilate's pronouncing the sentence and Christ's crucifixion. For there was a Cross to be provided, which perhaps was not yet got ready; and it would take up some time to go to the place of execution, because Christ was not well able to carry his Cross, and then there must be also some time allow'd for their crucifying him. It can hardly be doubted but that it was so; and therefore if Christ was not condemned, properly speaking, till a little before the sixth hour, as the Doctor supposes, it will be difficult to understand how he was crucified in the second Quarter of the day. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

Dr. Hammond in his Annotation says, that Christ was condemned and led immediately to Crucifixion about the sixth hour, i.e. toward Noon or Mid-day, as he explains it in his Paraphrase. In the same Annotation he supposeth the time of Christ's Cru-
Crucifixion to have been somewhat before, but yet near our Twelve of Clock or Mid-day, that space which was call’d the Third hour drawing toward an end. It is plain then, when Dr. Hammond says that Christ was condemn’d toward Noon or Mid-day, he uses the words in such a Latitude as may well take in the time between his Condemnation and Crucifixion; and it is usual to take them in so large a sense: we say, it is toward Noon, tho’ it be only about eleven of Clock, or a little after it. And therefore our Monsieur, after his usual manner, misrepresents Dr. Hammond, when he makes him to suppose that Christ was not condemn’d till a little before the sixth hour, he had represented him more rightly, if he had made him say that Christ was not crucified till a little before the sixth hour. But these Arts must be us’d that he might seem to have an occasion to reflect upon Dr. Hammond when he had none.

He had the same End in his endeavouring to inlarge the Time between the pronouncing the sentence and the execution of it. He says that a Cross was to be provided, and yet in the next words he implies that one might be ready; for when he says Perhaps it was not got ready, he intimates that perhaps it was: But others make it to be out of all doubt; Such Engines of Death
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Death (say they) doubtless lay always ready about the Judgment-Hall. As to that which he says about our Saviour's being not well able to carry the Cross, he knew very well that it signifies nothing, because another being compell'd to bear it when he fainted, it did very little protract the time of their going to the place of Crucifixion.


S. Mark, who wrote before the Destruction of Jerusalem; seems to have reckoned the Hours after the manner of the Jews, and the Jews dated their first Hour from the rising of the Sun, and so by their third Hour we must understand the third from that time, viz. the Sun-rising; and accordingly, if we suppose that the Sun (pursuant to our method of computation from Mid-night) rose about six a clock, that which is S. Mark's third hour will be our ninth. And the Relation which the Evangelists give us of this matter, makes it reasonable to think that Christ was not crucified sooner.—— About the third hour from the rising of the Sun we will suppose that he was fastened to the Cross. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
I readily assent to every particular here mention'd but the last. I cannot believe that Christ was fastened to the Cross so soon as about the third hour from the Sun-rising or our nine a Clock, and our Monsieur says nothing to satisfy us that he was crucified so soon, and that he had hung three hours on the Cross at the sixth from the Sun's rising, when the darkness mention'd, S. Mat. 27. 45. begun, as he says in the words immediately following those which I have transcript'd. I shall not follow his Example but very shortly give the Reasons why I cannot assent to this, that Christ was fastened to the Cross so soon.


But how then is it said by S. John that Christ was condemn'd about the sixth hour, viz. according to the custom of the old Romans who used to reckon the beginning of their civil or artificial day from midnight: of which see A. Gellius Noct. Attic. 1. 3. c. 2. & Censorinus de die Natal. c. 23. I grant the same way of computation obtained afterwards among the Romans as among the Jews; but nevertheless the old Custom might also continue in some parts of the Empire, and therefore Plutarch in his Quest. Rom.
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82. makes it a matter of enquiry as a thing then in use, why they counted the beginning of the day from midnight? And this Custom was probably follow'd by S. John, who wrote a great while after the Destruction of Jerusalem. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad[.v.]

Here our Monsieur is at first very positive, and says confidently, that S. John, when he mentions the sixth hour, follows the Custom of the Romans, who begun their civil or artificial Day from Midnight; but afterward having considered better of it he abates of his confidence, and only says that this Custom was probably follow'd by S. John. But certainly no man that reads the Relation which the Evangelists give of this matter can grant even this, that it is as much as probable that Christ was condemn'd about the Sun's rising or our six a Clock in the Morning. Can any man think it probable that all the Transactions which preceded Pilate's condemning our blessed Saviour could be dispatched so early as about Sun-rising? It is true that S. John, c. 18. 28. says, that it was early when the Sanhedrim sent Jesus to Pilate, but no man can think that it was so early as to be much before Sun-rising; especially when
when S. Matthew c.27.1. tells us that morning being come all the Chief Priests and Elders, and the People held a Consultation about it before they sent him, which must take up some time; not to add that they could scarce expect that Pilate should come into the Judgment-Hall before Sunrising. Then let it be consider'd how many things interven'd between his being sent unto Pilate, and his being condemn'd by him. Pilate ask'd him some Questions, and then went out of the Judgment-Hall to the Jews, and they accuse Jesus. Then being return'd into the Judgment-Hall he ask'd Christ more Questions, and held some conference with him. After this he goes out to the Jews again, and asks them whether he should release to them Barabbas or Jesus. The chief Priests and Elders persuade the multitude to ask Barabbas. Then he canvassed the matter with them, but seeing that he could prevail nothing he took Water and wash'd his Hands, declaring that he was Innocent. Mention being made of Galilee, Pilate takes the hint, and sends Jesus to Herod, Tetrarch of Galilee, and he also questions with him in many words, also the chief Priests and Scribes accused him before Herod, at last having been mock'd and array'd with gorgeous Apparel he was sent back to Pilate.
Upon his return Pilate calls together the chief Priests, Elders and People, and canvasses the matter again very largely with them. He also took Jesus and scourged him, and the Soldiers put on him a Crown of Thorns and a Purple robe, and mock'd and buffeted him. Then Pilate goes out to the Jews again, taking Jesus along with him, and shewing him unto them and laboured that he might be releas'd. After this the Jews saying that he made himself the Son of God, Pilate went again into the Judgment-Hall, and asked Jesus whence he was, and laboured still for his release. But at last the Jews crying out that if he releas'd him he was not Caesar's Friend, he brought Jesus out again; and sitting down in the Judgment-Seat, in a place call'd the Pavement, he formally pass'd Sentence upon him. Certainly every one that considers these particulars together with others related at large by the Evangelists, all which pass'd that day before Pilate's pronouncing the Sentence upon our Saviour, will be satisfied that it is not so much as probable that he was condemn'd about the sixth hour, if by the sixth hour we will understand our six a clock in the Morning. I therefore cannot agree with our Monsieur, either as to the time when our Saviour was condemned, or as to the time when
when he was fastened to the Cross. He makes him to have been condemn'd about the Sun's rising, or our fix a clock in the Morning. I am so far from assenting to this, that I think that he was scarce brought to Pilate so soon as our fix a clock, and the things that interven'd between his being brought unto Pilate, and his being condemned could not be dispatch'd in three hours; and therefore it was after our nine a clock before he was condemned. And if it was after our nine a clock that he was condemned, then our Monsieur errs also as to the time of his being fastened to the Cross, which he supposes to be about our nine a clock, or about the third hour from the rising of the Sun as he calls it. Our Monsieur says truly, that it is highly probable that there was a considerable interval of time between Pilate's pronouncing the Sentence and Christ's Crucifixion. For tho' I do not say as he doth, that there was a Cross to be provided, yet there are several things mention'd by the Evangelists which interven'd between the pronouncing the Sentence, and the fastening him to the Cross. The Soldiers took him into the Common-Hall; and called together the whole Band, and stripped and mocked him, by putting a Reed in his hand, and a Scarlet Robe upon him, and bowing to him,
him, and spitting upon him; they also smote him, and at last taking the Robe off from him, and putting on him his own Raiment, they led him away with two Malefactors to the place of Execution, and lastly when they came thither they gave him Vinegar and Gall to drink. All these things pass'd between our Saviour's Condemnation and Crucifixion, and did certainly take up some time (tho' perhaps not so much as our Monsieur would have them to have taken up) and therefore if it was after our nine a clock when he was condemned, it was certainly after that time when he was fastened to the Cross. Therefore a Great Man says, that it is neither credible nor possible indeed; that those things which went before our Saviour's Crucifixion should be done in the three first hours of the day.

Petavius de Doctr. Temp. l. 12. c. 19. vers. fn. hath express'd the sum of that which I have said so well and succinctly, that I cannot but think that the pains of transcribing him will be well bestowed. Neque enim (says he) tantillo spatio duci Christus, accusari, interrogari, ad Herodem mitti, redire ad Pilatum, rogari populus utrum dare sibi mallet, condemnari, extra urbem ad supplicium educi, ac denique crucifi igni poterat: cunctante praeferint, ac tergiversante Prae-side, & quidvis agente, ut a morte innocen-
Animadversions upon

This Argument, on which I have so long insisted, is sufficient without the help of any other, to shew that S. John's sixth hour was not the sixth from mid-night (as the Romans reckon'd their hours) or our fix a clock in the morning; and yet, ex abundanti, I add a second, which is this: If it cannot be made appear that in any other place of his Gospel, where there is mention of the Hours, S. John follows the Roman Account of them; then it is not probable that he follows it here. But the former cannot be made appear. In one of the places, viz. S. Joh. 4. 6. there is the very same expression that we have here, S. Joh. 19. 14. The whole verse runs thus: Now Jacob's Well was there, and Jesus being wearied with his journey, sate thus (suppose in the posture of a wearied person) upon the Well; and it was about the sixth hour. Will our Monsieur pretend, that by the sixth hour here is meant the sixth from mid-night, or our fix in the morning? I appeal to himself, let him judge whether is more probable, that our Saviour was thus wearied with his journey about six a clock in the morning, or about twelve a clock at noon. Perhaps he had not begun his journey so soon as six a clock in the mor-
Can we explain S. Joh. 19. 14. better than by this place S. Joh. 4. 6. where we have the very same words? It being then so manifest, that S. John did not follow the Roman Custom of reckoning the Hours, S. Joh. 4. 6. Why should we think it probable that he follow'd it, S. Joh. 19. 14? The other places in which Hours are mention'd are these that follow, It was about the tenth hour, S. Joh. 1. 39. i.e. (as our Expositors say) four a clock in the afternoon, or two hours before the Sun's setting. At the seventh hour the fever left him, S. Joh. 4. 52. i.e. at one a clock after noon. Are there not twelve hours in the day? S. Joh. 11. 9. Our Monsieur will find it an hard task to prove that the Roman Custom of computing the Hours is follow'd in these places. In the two last of them S. John relates the words of our Saviour, and of a Nobleman's Servants; and did they also follow the Roman Custom? I conclude therefore, that these being the places in this Gospel wherein any number of Hours is mention'd; and it not appearing that the Roman Custom in reckoning the Hours is follow'd in any of them, there is no reason why we should imagine that it is follow'd here.

I cannot but observe that our Monsieur himself seems to start an Objection against this
this of S. John's following the Roman Custom. Tho' this was the Custom of the Old Romans to reckon the Hours from mid-night, yet I grant (says he) that the same way of computation obtain'd afterwards among the Romans as among the Jews. But, for my part, I question the truth of this which our Monsieur objects to himself. His own Authors A. Gellius, Censorinus and Plutarch, in the places alleged, say nothing of it; yea, our Monsieur grants that Plutarch speaks of the Custom of beginning the day at mid-night as a thing then in use. But this I am sure of, that if that which he objects to himself be true, he hath given no satisfactory answer to it; and withal, that our Monsieur's strange fancy that Christ was condemn'd about our sixth clock in the morning, is sufficiently confuted without the help of the Objection.

We may conclude then, that S. John here by the sixth hour understood the same which the other three Evangelists did, when they say, that from the sixth hour darkness was over all the land until the ninth hour. See S. Matt. 27. 45. S. Mark 15. 33. S. Luke 23. 44. Several judicious persons judge it very probable, that the darkness begun not long after that Christ was nailed to the Cross. The Evangelists relate his praying for his Crucifiers, their parting his rayment,
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ment, and casting lots, and setting over his head, the title Jesus of Nazareth, &c. his being revil'd and rail'd on by the Rulers and People, the Souldiers and those that passed by, and even by one of the Malesactors that were crucified with him, also the other Malesactors rebuking him for it, and praying to Jesus, together with his gracious Answer, as intervening between our Saviour's crucifixion, and darkness being over the whole land: But all this might not take up any long time. So that we may well suppose that our dear Lord was crucified some time before the sixth hour or mid-day, and when that hour was fully come (ræquirens opus, eis, S. Mark 15. 33.) when the Trumpet had founded twelve at noon, the Sun begun to be darkned. And we may observe how punctually S. Mark hath set down the time of our Saviour's crucifixion, of the dark-ness being over the whole land, and of his crying Eloi, Eloi. When he was crucified it was the third hour, c. 15. v. 25. i.e. that part of the day which was called the third hour was not yet ended. When the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land, v. 33. At the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, Eloi, &c. v. 34.

P. 212.
P. 212. in S. Joh. 21. 18.

Grotius here has this gloss, When thou hast added almost forty years to those which thou hast lived already. But out of what Chronology did he learn, that from the Year of Christ's death to the last of Nero, beyond which the death of S. Peter cannot be deferred, there was the space of forty Years? From the Year of Christ 33, in which he ascended into heaven, to the 68th in which Nero died, there were only 35 Years. And supposing S. Peter to have died Anno Christi 65, as the most exact Chronologers think, there will be fewer. I wonder that Dr. Hammond too should follow Grotius without any Examination.

Animadversion.

Our Monsieur asks out of what Chronology did Grotius learn, that from the Year of Christ's Death to the last of Nero there was the space of forty years? And I ask him out of what part of Grotius's Works did he learn that Grotius held that there was the space of 40 years from the Year of Christ's Death to the last of Nero? Grotius intimates here that there were almost 40 years from the Year of Christ's Crucif-
Crucifixion to the Year of St. Peter's; but there is a difference between the space of 40 years and almost 40 years. He might say almost 40 years, tho' 3 or 4 years wanted. Our Monsieur therefore had no reason here to quarrel with Grotius; and as to Dr. Hammond, he expresses himself more warily than Grotius. Within 40 years, so he. So that if there was not the space of complete 40 years between St. Peter's Martyrdom and his Saviour's Death, Dr. Hammond is safe enough. I shall not take notice that the words, That Dr. Hammond too should follow Grotius, are scarce sense, our Monsieur should have omitted the Particle too.

Our Monsieur here confidently affirms, 1. That Christ ascended into Heaven in his 33d Year. 2. That Nero died in the 68th Year of Christ. 3. That the most exact Chronologers think that St. Peter died An. Dom. 65. whereas I conceive it do's not become any one to be so positive in these things, since there are so many eminent Chronologers and other learned Men that are of a different opinion in each of these particulars.

As to the first, the Year of Christ's Suffering and Ascension, Clemens Alex. Stromat. 1. makes him to have suffer'd when he had lived 30 years, Tertullian agrees with him, save only that he adds Quasi, he was as if the
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were 30 years of Age; see him adv. Judaos c. 8. Petavius both in his Doctrina Tempor. and in the 2d Part of his Rationarium refers his Suffering to the 31st Year of the Vulgar Æra, tho' in the former Part of his Rationarium he says, that he was complete 34 Years of Age, (I suppose according to that which he accounted the truer Æra) however he agrees not with our Monsieur in either place. Job. Vossius in Dissertat. de tempore Dominica Passionis makes our Saviour's Suffering to have been in his 31st Year or his 29th according to the Vulgar Æra. Lud. Capellus in his Historia Apostolica, in the 32d Year of that Æra. As these make the Messiah to have been cut off before the Year assign'd by our Monsieur, so others say that he was cut off after it. In his 34th Year so Baronius, Salianus, Torniellus, &c. and before them Bede de Temporum ratione c. 4. and S. Hierome in Ezek. 42. if some have understood him rightly. Bishop Montague assigns his 35th Year as the Year of his Passion; see his Origin Eccles. Tom. 1. Part 2.

As to the second, the year of Nero's death, he confidently affirms that he died in the 68th Year of Christ. But Eusebius's Chronicon according to the Basil Edition, refers it to the 70th Year, according to Scaliger's Edition to the 69th. The latter account
account is followed by Genebrard, our Dr. Simson, Bucholzer and Constantin Phrygius, who make Nero to have died in the 69th Year; also I. Vossius’s 73d Year, (to which he refers the Death of Nero) answers to the 69th Year of the Vulgar Era. The former is follow’d by Baroinus and Massæus, who make him to have died in our Lord’s 70th Year. Tirinus will have him to have ended his Life in the 38th Year after our Saviour’s Death; and then if our Monsieur be in the right as to the Year of our Saviour’s Death, according to Tirinus, Nero died An. Dom. 71. Aldred refers his Death to An. Dom. 67. according to the Vulgar Era, to An. Dom. 69. according to that which he calls the true. Lydiat makes him to have died An. Dom. 66. or 67, at the latest, also Bunting An. Dom. 67, Synceius finally in An. Dom. 63.

In the third, viz. the Year of S. Peter’s Martyrdom, he expresses as much confidence as in the two former, affirming, that the most exact Chronologers think that he died An. Christi 65. But, 1. Why would not our Monsieur oblige the learned World, by acquainting it who the most exact Chronologers are? By doing this, he might have gratified those that might be desirous to consult them, to be satisfied that he hath rightly represented their opinion. As for
me, as I cannot rely upon his Fidelity in representing the sentiments of Authors, so I do not take him to be so great a Critick in Chronology as to be qualified to judge who are the exactest Chronologers.

2. Whatsoever our Monsieur's most exact ones say, there are good Chronologers who do not refer S. Peter's Suffering to the 65th of Christ. Eusebius's Chronicle, according to the Basil Edition, refers it to An. Dom. 70. according to Scaliger's to An. Dom. 69. In like manner the ancient Author before Oecumenius's Scholia assigns the 69th Year of Christ, as the Year of that Apostle's Martyrdom; as also Onuphius and Baronius do: but Abbas Urspergenis, Funccius and Maffaus assign An. Dom. 70. Bishop Pearson in his Annal. Paulin, Bucholcer, Bibliander and Constantinus Phrygio will have him to have suffer'd An. Dom. 68. Bishop Usher and Petavius An. Dom. 67. Bunting An. Dom. 66. Calvisius An. Dom. 64. Syncellus An. Dom. 63. Lydiat makes him to have suffer'd four Years before Nero's Death, which he refers (as we said) to An. Dom. 66. or 67, and so S. Peter's Martyrdom was according to him An. Dom. 62. or 63. I forbear to mention others, and shall only add, that If. Vossius refers S. Peter's Martyrdom to An. Dom. 72. i.e. An. Dom. 68. according to the Vulgar
gar Æra. None of all these are our Mon- 
fier's most exact Chronologers here, for 
they do not think that this Apostle died 
An. Dom. 65; and yet I shall shew hereaf- 
ter, that other where he is of another mind: 
Bishop Pearson, and those that with him 
pitch upon An. Dom. 68. are other where in 
his account the exactest Chronologers.

I have alledged so many Chronographers, 
only to let the Reader see that our Mon-
fier ought not to have pronounced so con-
fidently of the time of the Death of our 
Saviour, his Apostle, and that great Per-
secuter of the Professors of Christianity. 
In points about which there are so many 
various Opinions, and all different from 
his, and about which he himself might af-
terward be of another mind, he ought not 
to have been so positive; nor ought he to 
have expected that his saying that this or 
that was in such a Year, should be taken 
for a sufficient Confutation of Grotius, 
Dr. Hammond or any other.

From the Year of Christ 33, to the 68th, 
there were only 35 Years. But supposing S. Pe-
ter to have died Anno Christi 35, there will 
be fewer: Thus our Monsieur. Now I 
ask, What is the meaning of these words, 
There will be fewer? Is it that there will 
be fewer than 35 Years from An. Dom. 33, 
to An. Dom. 68. if we suppose S. Peter to 
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have died An. Dom. 65? Certainly no for whether we suppose it, or do not suppose it, the number of Years between An. Dom. 33. and An. Dom. 68. is the very same, they will be neither more nor fewer. Therefore our Monsieur ought to have said, But supposing S. Peter to have died An. Christi 65, there will be fewer than 35 Years from our Lord's Ascension to S. Peter's Crucifixion.

P. 214.

It is much more probable that S. Peter died in the Reign of Nero, and that in the Year of Christ 63, as A. Pagus has shewn. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Our Monsieur saying here, that it is much more probable that S. Peter died in the Reign of Nero; he that consults not Dr. Hammond, may be ready to think that he had said that S. Peter's Death was not in the Reign of Nero; but I challenge him to shew where he says so. As to the Reign then in the time of which S. Peter was put to death, there is no difference; but as to the Year of our Lord, Dr. Hammond in his Premonition to the Acts of the Apostles refers his Death to An. Dom. 68. But our Monsieur says, that it is much more probable that
be died An. Dom. 65. yet produces no Arguments by which his Reader might be satisfied that this is much more probable; only he sends us to A. Pagus, who (says he) hath shewn it. We then now see who are the most exact Chronologers in our Mon- sieur's account, viz. himself and A. Pagus, and some others that hold that S. Peter suffer'd An. Dom. 65. if there be any such; for a little before, p. 212. he says, that the most exact Chronologers think that S. Peter died An. Dom. 65. As to Ant. Pagi, what shall we say if (notwithstanding our Mon- sieur's so confidently alledging him) he neither hath shew'd, nor ever design'd to shew, that S. Peter was put to death An. Dom. 65? His own words are very plain to this pur- pose, Petrus non ultimo Neronis anno, sed undecimo Martyrium subiit, ut suo loco de- monstravi; so Pagi in An. Dom. 298. num. 3. He is disputing against Bishop Pearson, who refers S. Peter's Martyrdom to the last Year of Nero; but (says Pagi) I have shew'd in its proper place that his Martyrdom was in Nero's 11th Year, not in his last. Now, according to Pagi, the 11th Year of Nero answers to An. Dom. 64. not to An. Dom. 65. (An. Dom. 64. Neronis 11. so Pagi) and therefore in the place alledged he tells us plainly, that he had demonstrated that S. Peter suffered Martyrdom An. Dom. 64.
as Calvisius and Lud. Cappellus in Historia Apostolica had before him refer'd the Apostle's Death to that Year. I know that Pagi in An. Dom. 65, makes mention of the Apostle's suffering in these words An. Dom. 65: Neronis 12. persecutio adversus Christianos continuata, in qua Rome occubuerunt Apostolorum principes Petrus & Paulus; but he doth not say that they died in that Year, but only that they died in that Persecution, which begun in An. Dom. 64. and continued in An. Dom. 65. So that here is nothing contrary to that which he says to plainly in the place which I first allledged; that S. Peter suffer'd Martyrdom in the 11th Year of Nero, or in An. Dom. 64. I shall only add that our Monsieur, who here in opposition to Dr. Hammond says, that it is more probable that the Apostle was put to death An. Dom. 65, than that he suffer'd An. Dom. 68, afterward with Dr. Hammond makes him to have suffer'd An. Dom. 68.

P. 224. in Act. 7. 4.

Those who correct the Mosaical Chronology by S. Stephens Discourse, of which number is Lud. Cappellus, think that Abraham was born, not in the sixtieth, but in the hundred and thirtieth year of Terah's Age. But if this were so, why did Abraham
ham think it so strange that a man of a hun-
dred years of Age should be able to get Chil-
dren, when he himself had been begotten by
his Father when he was thirty years older? See Gen. 17. 17. But they on the other hand
ask us, whether it is likely that Terah, who accompanied Abraham out of Ur, should
rather chuse to stay five and sixty years at
Charran, than go to Abraham? Why not,
when he had his Son Nachor there with
him, who had a numerous family. But;
at least, say they, after the miraculous birth
of Isaac, he should have gone to Abraham.
This cannot according to them be any such
great Miracle, and their inference from it
is weak. For Terah might have a great
many reasons for his staying at Charran,
more than we know of. Thus Monsieur
Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

When our Monsieur says, Those who
correct the Mosaical Chronology by S. Ste-
phen's Discourse, of which number is Lud.
Cappellus, he would persuade us that
there are some who think that Moses's
Chronology is erroneous, and stands in
need of being corrected; and that Lud.
Cappellus is one of them. But I challenge
him to shew where either Lud. Cappellus,
or any other Christian Writer doth take upon him to correct Moses's Chronology, or impute any error to it. Their business is to make it appear that both Moses and Stephen do speak the Truth, and that if there be some seeming, yet there is no real difference between them. I cannot imagine why our Monsieur mentions Terah's 60th year, for neither doth he hold that Abraham was born in that year, nor doth Cappellus deny it, or make mention of it, that which he and such as are of his opinion say is that Abraham was born not in Terah's 70th year, but in his 130th.

This our Monsieur should have confuted by solid Arguments, but instead of doing that he only starts this little Objection, Why did Abraham think it so strange that a man of a hundred years of Age should get Children, when he himself had been begotten by his Father when he was thirty years older? Gen. 17. 17. But this very Text, Gen. 17. furnishes us with a ready Solution of the Objection. For when Abraham had said, Shall a Child be born to him that is an hundred years old? he stops not there, but adds, And shall Sarah who is 90 years old bear? That therefore which he thought strange was, that he should have a Child by Sarah. As to himself he had a Child by Hagar not many years before, as he had Children
Children also by another Wife after Sarah's Death, and therefore if he had only been told that he should have a Child, this would not have seem'd so strange, for he might think that it should be by another Wife; but when he is told that he should have a Son by Sarah, who had been his Wife so many years and never conceiv'd by him, and who was now 90 years old, this might justly seem strange.

Lud. Cappellus had argued thus, Is it likely that Therah, who at God's command given to Abraham came to Charran with a purpose to go to Canaan, would stay there 65 years, and not be moved with the news of God's extraordinary blessing upon Abraham, in giving him a Son in so miraculous a manner when both he and Sarah were of so great years? What now faith our Monsieur in answer to this? 1. He asks, Why might not Terah chuse to stay at Charran, since he had his Son Nachor there with him, who had a numerous Family? 2. He says that the Birth of Isaac cannot, according to them, be any such great Miracle. 3. He adds, that their inference is weak, for Terah might have many Reasons for staying at Charran more than we know of. Now as to the first of these Answers, our Monsieur asserts in it two Things which he can never prove. 1. That Terah
rah had his Son Nachor with him at Char- ran. 2. That Nachor had a numerous Family while Terah was living. Neither of these hath any ground in the Scripture History; yea the sacred History intimates the contrary, and that plainly enough. We read Gen. 11. 31. that Terah took Abraham, Lot, and Sarai, and they went forth from Ur, and came to Haran or Charran, and dwelt there. If Nachor had come to Charran and dwelt there with them, would not the sacred Text have mention’d him as well as the rest? Its saying Terah took Abraham, Lot and Sarai, not naming Nachor, seems plainly enough to exclude him. Again Gen. 22. 20. we read, After these things it was told Abraham, that Milcah had born Children to his Brother Nachor. After these things, i.e. after that God had tempted Abraham whether he would offer up Isaac, Abraham had the news of Nachor’s numerous Family; now if he had had such a Family living with Terah in Charran, Abraham could not have been a stranger to it so long. For we cannot suppose that (if Terah had lived at Charran after that Abraham had removed thence to Canaan) Abraham would have been so undutiful and unnatural, as not either to go himself and see his Father, or to send some Servant to enquire of his health; and
if he had done either, he could not have been so long ignorant of the state of Na-
chor's Family, supposing (as our Monsieur doth) that Terah had Nachor with him.
As to our Monsieur's second answer, that the birth of Isaac cannot according to Lud.
Cappellus be any such great Miracle, it is utterly false as I have already shew'd in
my answer to our Monsieur's little Ob-
jection against Cappellus's opinion. As to
the last answer, that Terah might have ma-
ny reasons for staying at Charran more than
we know of, it is plain that it is no more
than a conjecture; and withal they must
be very weighty Reasons which could de-
tain him at Charran, when at his coming
from Ur he had a purpose to go to Ca-
naan, Gen. 11. 31. and when God's having
extraordinarily bless'd Abraham in the mi-
raculous birth of Isaac invited him to go.
By this that hath been said it appears how
little our Monsieur had to say against the
opinion of Cappellus, and many other ex-
cellent Expositors and Chronologers con-
cerning Terah's Age at the time of Abra-
ham's Birth, as also how inexcusable his pre-
sumption is in charging the Protomartyr
Stephen with error upon such flight
grounds; and finally how great reason he
hath heartily to repent and pray that this
great sin may be forgiven him.
I shall only add, that some of the Jewish Writers have discover'd the mistake of those who make Abraham to have been born in the 70th year of Terah's Age, particularly Manasseh ben Israel, who in his Conciliator Quest. 35. says, that Abraham was the youngest Son of Terah; and that Terah might be 205 years of Age when Abraham was only 75; according to which account Abraham left Charran in the same Year that Terah died. The same Manasseh B. Is. concludes thus, Quare dicemus, &c. We will say that Terah begat Children when he was of the Age of 70, first Nachor, after some years Haran, and after complete 60 years Abraham. Now 70 years and 60 make 130, so that Terah's 130th year was the Year of Abraham's Birth, according to this learned Jew, as well as according to Cappellus, and many other Christian Writers.

P. 398. in Gal. 2. 1.

Dr. Pearson has excellently shown in his Annales Paulinæ, that S. Paul reckons the years that had pass'd from the time of his Conversion. But he refers the Jerusalem Synod to the Year of Christ 49, and makes S. Paul's Conversion to have happen'd two years later than Dr. Hammond, and that with
if Bishop Pearson have excellently shown that S. Paul reckons the years that had pass'd from the time of his Conversion, then he confirms that which Dr. Hammond says, for it is his opinion that the 14 years, Gal. 2. 1. are to be reckon'd from that great Epocha, so considerable to S. Paul, the time of his Conversion. But as to the Year of his Conversion or of the Jerusalem Synod, they do not perfectly agree. As to the former, Dr. Hammond according to his wonted modesty expresses himself thus, S. Paul's Conversion immediately succeeding the death of S. Stephen may reasonably be placed in the first Year after Christ's Assumption, An. Ch. 24. to which Year Eusebius, Lightfoot and others do also refer it, whereas Bishop Pearson places it not two years later (as our Monsieur says) but An. Dom. 35. As to the Jerusalem Synod, Dr. Hammond says only that it is ordinarily placed An. Ch. 47. whereas Bishop Pearson refers it to An. Ch. 49; but whether with good reason (as our Monsieur says) or not, I do not know, for I have not found that he gives any. Of Annals Pauline hereafter.

P. 422.
This Epistle is with more probability refer'd by Dr. Pearson to the Year of Christ 62; or the ninth of Nero. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad.

Our Monsieur says this of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and he afterward says the same of the Epistles to the Philippians and the Colossians; see P. 445, and 461. In assigning the date of the three Epistles he chooses to follow the Annales Paulini ascribed to Bishop Pearson, rather than Dr. Hammond; which may seem strange upon several accounts. 1. The Annales are a posthumous Work, but the Paraphrase and Annotations were published, and also revised by the Author himself long before his Death. 2. The Annales were perhaps writ in the Bishop's younger years before he had seen and considered what Dr. Hammond writes concerning the date of these Epistles, and he might be of another opinion afterward. 3. I the rather incline to think that the Bishop had not seen the Annotations, for if he had I believe that he would have imitated Dr. Ham
Dr. Hammond's Caution. Of the Epistle to the Ephesians he only says, that it was writ about the Yeare 58; of that to the Colossians, that it was writ near about the same time with that to the Ephesians; of that to the Philippians, his words are these; Epaphroditus their Bishop being sent from them to him with a supply of Money about the Yeare of Christ 59, he returns them this Epistle by Epaphroditus; Thus Dr. Hammond.

As our Monsieur doth not give us the Reasons that moved him to follow the Annals, rather than the Annotations; so the Annals (as far as I have observed) do not afford us any such Reasons as might compel him to follow them. But our Monsieur says p. 535, that the most exact Chronologers refer the writing the Epistle to the Colossians to the 62d Yeare of Christ; and we ought not to think it strange that he should follow the account of the most exact Chronologers. In answer to which I say, that he ought to have told us who are the most exact Chronologers. We know that Bishop Pearson here is one; but, 1. Who are the other?

2. Time was when Bishop Pearson was not one of the most exact Chronologers; for p. 212. our Monsieur says, that the most exact Chronologers think that S. Peter died Anno Dom. 65; whereas Bishop Pearson did not think so, but referr'd the Apostle's
Martyrdom to Anno Dom. 68. I conclude therefore, that in our Monsieur's account the same persons are the most exact Chronologers, and not the most exact Chronologers; they are the exactest Chronologers when they please his fancy, or serve his purpose; but when they do not suit and serve these, they are not.

P. 424. in Epist. ad Ephes.

The same learned Man (i.e. Dr. Pearson) proves, that what our Author mentions in this Premonition about Timothy's being left at Ephesus, happened in the Year of Christ 64. P. 509. in 1 Epift. ad Timoth. It is not likely that Timothy was left Bishop at Ephesus, that presently after he should leave that City, and travel with S. Paul, and go to visit him as far as Rome. It is much more probable that Timothy was ordained Bishop of Ephesus after S. Paul was releas'd from his Bonds, and went from Rome to Asia, about the Year of Christ 64, or the 11th of Nero, and that the Year after this Epistle was written, as Dr. Pearson in his Annales Paulinæ thinks. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Dr. Hammond was of opinion that Timothy was left at Ephesus at that time when S. Paul departed from thence to go to Macedonia, Act. 20. 1. To this our Monsieur opposes, 1. The Authority of Bishop Pearson. 2. This one argument, *It is not likely* (says he) *that Timothy was left Bishop at Ephesus, that presently after he should leave that City, and travel with S. Paul, and go to visit him as far as Rome.* To which I answer, That it is very true that Timothy was not left Bishop at Ephesus for these ends, to leave the City presently after, to travel with S. Paul, and visit him at Rome; but our Monsieur knows that neither Dr. Hammond, nor any other, ever said that he was left Bishop at Ephesus for those ends. Besides, our Monsieur cannot tell us how soon Timothy left that City after S. Paul’s departure thence for Macedonia, nor how long he travell’d with S. Paul after that time, nor how long it was before he went to Rome; whereas all these things are to be consider’d, that we may judge whether they may be consistent with his being Bishop of Ephesus or no. We hear not of Timothy’s having left Ephesus after S. Paul’s departure thence, Act. 20. 1. till v. 4; and therefore all that which is recorded, v. 2.
and 3. did intervene between Timothy's being left at Ephesus, and his leaving it, according to Dr. Hammond. S. Paul went through the parts of Macedonia, giving them much Exhortation; after which he went to Greece v. 2, there he abode three months, whence he purposed to return to Macedonia v. 3. Thither he did return; and then at last v. 4, we hear of Timothy, that when S. Paul was for going from Macedonia to Asia, he was one of those who went before and tarried for the Apostle at Troas. Now some time must be allow'd for every one of these the Apostles removes, for his going from Ephesus to Macedonia, for his passing through the parts of Macedonia, his going thence to Greece, and returning from Greece thither, together with his three month's abode in Greece; so that all of these laid together must take up a very considerable time, in all which we do not find that Timothy was absent from Ephesus. And therefore it may seem strange that any one should mention his being left Bishop at Ephesus, that he should leave it presently after, for it cannot be proved that he did leave it presently after. But it may justly seem more strange, that any one should mention his Travelling with S. Paul as an Argument against Dr. Hammond, when we read so little of Timothy's Travelling with him.
him after his departure from Ephesus, Act. 20. 1. All that the History of the Acts says of it is, that Timothy was one of those that accompanied S. Paul into Asia, and going before, tarried for him at Troas, Act. 20. 4, 5. But it is the strangest of all, that our Monsieur should mention Timothy’s going to visit S. Paul as far as Rome, as if that was inconsistent with his being Bishop of Ephesus. Bishop Polycarp’s Example may satisfy us, that in the Primitive times Bishops were not so strictly bound to Residence, but that they might go so far as from Asia to Rome. Thus I have fully discover’d the invalidity of our Monsieur’s arguings against Dr. Hammond.

As to Bishop Pearson allledged here by our Monsieur, his main Argument against Dr. Hammond’s opinion is that which he urges both in the Annales Paulini, and in his Dissertations de successione primorum Rome Episcoporum, p. 76. viz. That S. Paul sent Timothy before into Macedonia, Act. 19. 22. and so could not leave him at Ephesus when he departed thence to go into Macedonia, Act. 20. 1. To which I answer, that S. Luke, who informs us Act. 19. 22, that S. Paul sent Timothy into Macedonia, presently adds, that the Apostle himself stay’d for a season in Asia; so that Timothy might return to him before he left Asia. It is very proba-
probable that being resolved to stay some
time in Asia, he sent two of those that mi-
nistred to him, Timothy and Erasius to Ma-
cedonia, to know the state of the Churches,
and to return and give him an account of it.
S. Luke's Silence as to Timothy's return, aff-
fords no firm Argument against it; and on
the other hand, in 1 Cor. 16. 10, 11. we seem
to have good ground for believing it. Ac-
cording to Bishop Pearson, S. Paul writ this
first Epistle to the Corinthians from Asia,
and during that his stay there which I have men-
tion'd: Now here, ch. 16. v. 10, 11.
he bids the Corinthians, if Timothy came,
to conduct him forth that he might come to
him, for he look'd for him. From which
words it seems to be manifest, that the Apo-
sle expected Timothy's return to him in
Asia, from whence he writ according to
Bishop Pearson.

The Bishop seems to have foreseen that
this Answer might be made, and therefore
to satisfy us that Timothy did not return
to Asia before the Apostle's departure
there, mention'd Acts 20. 1. he adds, that
then, when he sent him into Macedonia, the
Apostle gave him in charge, having dispatch-
ed his business thereto go to Corinth; thus
the Bishop alluding for this 1 Cor. 4. 17.
But an 1 Cor. 4. 17. the Apostle only tells
the Corinthians that he had sent Timothy to
them,
them, he doth not say that he sent him to them at the same time that he sent him into Macedonia, or that he had given him in charge, having dispatched his business in Macedonia to come to them; of this there is not the least intimation. I add, that if we should be so liberal as to grant that S. Paul gave Timothy a charge first to go to Macedonia, then to Corinth, it would nothing advantage the Bishop, for he might do both, and yet return to Asia before S. Paul left it.

The Bishop urges other things, as that S. Paul wrote the first Epistle to the Corinthi- ans at that time when Timothy was yet in Macedonia; but how doth he prove this? for that which he adds, that in that Epistle he recommends Timothy to them in these words, If Timothy come, see that he be with you without fear, 1 Cor. 16. 10. cannot be thought to be a proof of it. He urges also, that in Macedonia the Apostle received Timothy coming from Corinth, and that not long after he writ the second Epistle to the Corinthi- ans from Macedonia, 2 Cor. 7. 5. 8. 1. 9. 2. together with Timothy, 2 Cor. 1. 1; and that afterward Timothy follow'd S. Paul from Macedonia to Achaia, and was with him in Achaia when he writ the Epistle to the Romans, Rom. 16. 21. and left Achaia together with him; Thus Bishop Pearson. And I
grant that he hath clearly proved that Timothy was with S. Paul when he writ the Epistle to the Romans, and the second Epistle to the Corinthians; as also, that it is not improbable that those Epistles were writ from the places which he mentions: but of the rest the Sacred History is wholly silent as far as I have found. I do not find in Holy Writ that the Apostle received Timothy in Macedonia coming from Corinth, and that he writ the second Epistle to the Corinthians not long after, or that after this Timothy follow'd S. Paul from Macedonia to Achaia, and left Achaia together with him; and I question whether any of these things can be as much as probably deduced from it.

Thus upon occasion of our Monsieur's opposing Bishop Pearson to Dr. Hammond, I have taken the boldness to examine that which the Bishop says against the Doctor's opinion; and I do not see that our Monsieur had reason to say, that the Bishop's opinion is much more probable than it.

Here, p. 509. we have Annales Paulina, as also p. 398, 445, and 599, so that it cannot be said to be the mistake of the Printer. It may be therefore that our Monsieur would here shew his Critical Art; and whereas Bishop Pearson, or his Editors, had said Annales Paulini, he lets them know that
that they were in a mistake, they should have said Pauline, not Paulini; Annales, being not of the Masculine Gender, but the Feminine. And yet we meet with Annales maximi in Cicero de Orat. l. 2. Annales prisci in Claudian Paneg. 3. sextum Annalem in Pliny l. 7. c. 28. Octavo Annalium in A. Gellius l. 17. c. 13, &c. therefore if Paulini be a mistake, we must conclude that all these did not understand their own language.

Dr. Pearson and other most exact Chronologers suppose this Epistle was written in the Year of Christ 52, or the 12th of Claudius. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

Dr. Hammond assigning the time of the writing the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, according to his wonted caution and modesty only says, Perhaps it is discoverable by comparing 1 Thel. 3. 6. with Act. 18. 5. and It was about his first preaching at Corinth, which is placed by Chronologers in the 50th Year of Christ. Observe his Language Perhaps and About such a time, not At such a time; and he do's not himself.
himself determine in what Year S. Paul first preached at Corinth, but only tells the opinion of Chronologers concerning it. But the Doctor did not consult the most exact Chronologers, whereas our Monseur always consults them. And we see that Bishop Pearson is here one of them, tho' p. 212. he was not; but who the rest are I know not. Calvijus, Petavius, Jac. Cappellus and Dr. Simpson are not the most exact Chronologers, for they name the same Year that Dr. Hammond doth, viz. An. Dom. 50. Likewise Archbishop Usher, Lud. Cappellus and Dr. Lightfoot are not, for the first of these refers the writing the Epistle to An. Dom. 54, the second to An. Dom. 48, the last to An. Dom. 51. Perhaps Baronius, who assigns An. Dom. 52, as Bishop Pearson doth, is here one of the most exact Chronologers; tho' otherwhere our Monseur fliglits him, and upbraids Dr. Hammond with following him.

This Epistle is refered by Dr. Pearson to the Year of Christ 53, or the 13th Year of Claudius. Thus Monseur Le Clerc.
Animadu.

Chronologers differ likewise about the date of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians. It is known that Gratian thought that this (the call'd the second) was writ before the other. Archbishop Usher, Calvisius, Petavius, Lud. Cappellus, Dr. Lightfoot, &c. suppose that they were both writ in the same year, but they are not agreed what year that was. The best way therefore is to imitate Dr. Hammond's caution and modesty. This Epistle (says he) seems to have been written not many months after the former, about the 51 of Christ.

P. 525.

Notwithstanding all that is here said by our Author, it is much more probable that S. Paul wrote this Epistle after his last Bondage, in the year of Nero 13, and of Christ 67, a little before his Death, as it is thought by Dr. Pearson, who has easily solved all the difficulties which our Author here objects against that opinion. I shall say something to them on Chap. 4. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadu.
Our Monsieur ought to have informed us where it is that Bishop Pearson solves all the Difficulties, which Dr. Hammond objects against his opinion concerning the time of the Apostle's writing the 2d Epistle to Timothy. I have consulted both the Annals and the Dissertations, and do not find that he takes any notice of them. However our Monsieur tells us, that he says something to them on Chap. 4.; but if he do say something, it is very little, and that as little to the purpose, indeed less. Dr. Hammond, in his Premonition before the second Epistle to Timothy, alledges both the 12th and 16th Verse of the 4th Chapter to prove that it was not written at the later time of S. Paul's being prisoner at Rome. But our Monsieur takes no notice at all of the 12th Verse; and the words of the 16th and 17th Verses are these, At my first defence all forsook me, yet the Lord stood with me, that the preaching might be fulfilled, and that all the Gentiles might hear, &c. This (says Dr. Hammond) seems to refer it to the first being at Rome, after which time he proclaimed the Gospel to the Gentiles in other Regions. What now says our Monsieur to this? he answers p. 529. 

1. This
i. This cannot be understood of that Defence, which S. Paul made for himself when he was first in Bonds: for undoubtedly he would not have told Timothy a thing which he already very well knew, as having been present with him at that time, nor have said what was nothing to the purpose; thus our Monsieur. But how doth he prove this which he affirms so confidently, viz. that Timothy was present with S. Paul at that Defence which he made when he was first in Bonds at Rome. That Timothy was with S. Paul at Rome when he was first Prisoner there, I readily grant; but it will not follow that he was with him there when he made his first Defence. He was with the Apostle at Rome when he writ the Epistles to the Philippians, and Colossians and Philemon, and if our Monsieur can prove that he writ them before his making that Defence he did something, but it is impossible for him to do this.

2. He speaks of his pleading before him whom Nero at his departure into Greece left Governor of the City of Rome, by whom he was not presently condemned, but yet kept still in Bonds, perhaps till Nero’s Return; by which means many in the mean time had the Gospel preached to them. Thus our Monsieur; but if you desire some proof of all this, that S. Paul, 2 Tim. 4. 16. speaks of his
his pleading before the Governor whom Nero had left, and that the Governor did not condemn him but keep him still in Bonds, you may go and seek it where you please; for here you have none, unless that which he says in his Note on 2 Tim. 4. 17. was designed for a proof. Our Monsieur there says, that the Mouth of the Lion signifies the Governor, whom he there calls Helius, alleging for this the Authority of Bishop Pearson in Annal. Paulin. But the Bishop doth not say that the Mouth of the Lion signifies Helius; tho' he doth make the Lion to be Helius, but tenders no proof of it; so that it can pass for no more than a Conjecture.

3. See Grotius on the following Verse, by whom it will appear, it was not well understood by our Author in his Premonition. Thus our Monsieur, who being not satisfied with these solutions of the Difficulty urged by Dr. Hammond calls in the assistance of Grotius upon 2 Tim. 4. 17. The words not well understood by Dr. Hammond in his Premonition (as he pretends) are these, that by me the preaching might be fulfilled, and that all the Gentiles might hear. Dr. Hammond understands them of his proclaiming the Gospel to the Gentiles in other Regions, but Grotius only of his preaching to those of diverse Nations, who
who had business in aula Caesaris, at Court as we use to speak. Which seems to me to be a forced Interpretation, and I conceive that the Apostle's meaning is, that the Lord stood with and deliver'd him, that he might fulfil the preaching, i.e. preach the Gospel in those parts in which he had not preach'd it before, and so all the Gentiles or Nations (マルiß) might hear. I only add that it may be more truly said that Grotius shews that those words in the same Verse, The Mouth of the Lion are not well understood by our Monsieur, who makes them to signify Helius, whereas Grotius by the Lion understands Nero, and observes that Seneca call'd Nero a Lion.

P. 529. in 2. Tim. 4. 18.

The Lord will deliver me] These words are alledged by our Author in his Premonition, to prove that S. Paul here speaks of a danger he was delivered from: Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Here I must transcribe Dr. Hammond's words in his Premonition. And for the one Argument on the other side the approaching of his Death, to that may be opposed what
what he adds c. 4. 17, 18. that he was delivered out of the mouth of the Lion, i.e. either from Nero or from his great danger; adding confidently for the future that the Lord shall deliver him, which was literally true of this first, but cannot in the sense of delivering him from his danger be verified of his last danger, from which he was not deliver'd; Thus Dr. Hammond. Everyone now sees that the Doctor's business here is not to prove that S. Paul here speaks of a danger he was deliver'd from (as our Monsieur represents it) but to answer an Argument against him, taken from the expressions in this 4th Chapter which seem to signify the approach of his Death. If our Monsieur had only said that Dr. Hammond interprets those words The Lord will deliver me, so as that he makes S. Paul to speak of a danger that he was deliver'd from, I should have granted it, for it is very true that the Apostle speaks of a danger from which he was deliver'd, even according to Grotius's Exposition of those words, From every evil work, for the Lord did deliver him from the danger of doing any thing unworthy of a Christian or an Apostle. These are Grotius's words, and Dr. Hammond in his Paraphrase transcribes them, and all the difference between Grotius and him is, that he makes the mean-
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ing of the words *Every evil work* to be more comprehensive than Grotius does, and to take in also his danger from the Persecuters of Christianity. His words in his Paraphrase are there, *I shall be deliver'd from every enterprise against me, however that he will keep me from doing any thing unworthy of an Apostle or Servant of his.*

P. 530.

Dr. Pearson with more reason refers the writing of this Epistle to the Year 65, in which also S. Paul wrote his first to Timothy. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad.

Dr. Hammond do's not set down the Year in which the first Epistle to Timothy was writ. As to that to Titus he remarks that the Apostle is said to have writ it *An. Chr. 55.* To those by whom this is said our Monsieur opposes Bishop Pearson, who in *Annales Paulini* (if they be his) dates this Epistle ten years later, i.e. *An. Chr. 65,* but he renders no reason for his referring it to that Year. He names S. Chrysostom and Theophylact, who say in general that the Apostle writ this Epistle when he was
was in ædibus, but mention not either this or any other Year. As to the first Epistle to Timothy our Monsieur is very positive that S. Paul wrote it in the same year, but after his usual manner forgets to impart to us his reasons for such confidence.

P. 571.

It is much more probable that S. James was kill'd in the Year of Christ 60, as Ant. Pagus on that year hath shown. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Here our Monsieur opposes not only Dr. Hammond together with Archbishop Usher, Dr. Lightfoot, Baronius, yea and Eusebius according to the Basil Edition, who refer S. James his Martyrdom to An. Chr. 63; but also the Annales Paulini which make him to have suffer'd An. Chr. 62, as Calvinus also and others do. Perhaps the reason why he here forsakes the Annales which he is wont to follow is, because they differ less from Dr. Hammond, than Pagi doth. As to Pagi his Argument for An. Chr. 60. is from Josephus Antiqu. l.20. c.8, where (says he) having related thestoning of James, and the coming of Albinus
binus Procurator of Judea, he (i.e. Josephus) adds, Hoc tempore, &c. At this time King Agrippa having inlarged Cæsarea Philippi, call'd it Neronias in honour of Nero, &c. And after that he hath alleeged these things out of Josephus, he makes it his business to prove that the inlarging Cæsarea, and calling it by that new name was An. Chr. 60, and thence confidently concludes that James was put to death in that Year: Thus Pagi. But for my part I am not satisfied, either that it can be proved from Josephus, that the death of S. James and the inlarging Cæsarea were in the same Year, or that Pagi hath proved that the inlarging Cæsarea was in An. Dom. 60. As to Josephus, I do not see how it can be proved from him that S. James's Martyrdom, and the inlarging Cæsarea were in the same year, for he relates many things which happen'd between the one and the other, as the sending Messengers to King Agrippa to inform him what Ananus had done, Albinus's coming from Alexandria to Judea, and his sending sharp and threatening Letters to Ananus, whom the Jews had accused also to him, King Agrippa's deposing Ananus from the High Priesthood, and conferring that Dignity on Jesus the Son of Damneus, Albinus's care to apprehend the Sicarii, Ananias's Liberality,
rality, and his courting both Albinus and the new High Priest, and lastly the great vexation which the said Ananias had from the Sicarii. After all this follows (not Hoc tempore, At this time as Pagi) but καὶ τὸν ἐπ ξαμάν, According to this time, or About this time King Agrippa, did enlarge and adorn Cæsarea Philippi, giving it the name of Neronias. By this account it appears that it cannot be proved out of Josephus that S. James's Martyrdom and King Agrippa's enlarging Cæsarea Philippi were in the same Year, and then it is to no purpose to enquire whether Pagi hath firmly proved that Agrippa's enlarging that City was in the Year of Christ 60, as I said before I am not satisfied that he hath.

P. 599.

Our Author followed as he ordinarily do's, Cæl. Baronius as to the Year of Christ in which S. Peter suffer'd Martyrdom. But Ant. Pagus contends that it happened in the Year of Christ 65, and Dr. Pearson in 68, whom I chuse to follow. But if we suppose S. Peter died at Rome in the year which Dr. Hammond thinks, and that he wrote this Epistle a little before his death, it cannot be said that the Jewish War was then approaching, which began in the 12th of Nero,
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Nero, and in the 2d of Gessius Florus
President of Judea, and of Christ 66, and
in the Month of May; See Dr. Pearson's
Annales Paulinæ. Thus Monsieur Le
Clerc.

Animadv.

Here I shall shew how our Monsieur
both is injurious to Dr. Hammond, and al-
so contradicts himself. 1. He contradicts
that which he says in p. 212, and 214. In
p. 212, he says, that the most exact Chro-
nologers think that S. Peter died An. Chr. 65.
and p. 214, that it is much more probable
that S. Peter died in the Year of Christ 65,
as A. Pagus has shewn; so that in both
these places he refers that Apostle's Mar-
tyrdom not to An. Chr. 68, as Dr. Ham-
mond doth, but with Pagi to An. Chr. 65:
and yet in p. 599 quite contrary he chuses
to follow Bishop Pearson who agrees with
Dr. Hammond in referring it to An. Chr.
68, rather than Pagi, who refers it to
An. Chr. 65, as our Monsieur says. 2. He
is injurious to Dr. Hammond: He says
that Dr. Hammond follows Baronius as to
the Year of Christ in which S. Peter suffer'd
Martyrdom, which he do's not; for as I
have often said he refers it to An. Chr. 68,
but Baronius to An. Chr. 69; see Baronius
ad
ad An. Dom. 69. Num. 1. Our Monsieur further urges against Dr. Hammond, that if S. Peter writ his second Epistle and was put to death in the Year which the Doctor mentions, it cannot be said that the Jewish War was then approaching: which began in the Year of Christ 66. For answer to which I grant that the Annales Paulini make the Jewish War to have begun An. Chr. 66, I grant also that Dr. Hammond faileth that the writing S. Peter’s second Epistle was near the Jewish War, but Dr. Hammond do’s not speak of that beginning of the War which the Annales do. The Annales speak of that beginning when Jerusalem was first besieged by the Romans, but Dr. Hammond of that which Eusebius mentions when the Jews rebelling Vespasian was sent against them. This Eusebius refers to the last Year of Nero and An. Chr. 70. according to the Basil Edition, and 69 according to Jos. Scaligers. This War ended in the destruction of the City and Temple, and so Dr. Hammond describes it the War on which follow’d the destruction of the Jews; whereas the first siege was rais’d, and the Roman Army then overthrown. We have here the fourth time Annales Paulina, of which I have spoke before.
P. 641. in Rev. 6. 4.

It was worth observing that Eusebius makes mention of two Famines under the Reign of Claudius, one foretold by Agabus, and to be refer'd to the second Year of Claudius, tho' he mentions it on his 4th; another in Greece and at Rome, which he refers to the 9th and 10th Years of that Emperor. I know that Jo. Scaliger thinks that the latter was foretold by Agabus, and refers it to the 5th Year of Claudius; but he gives no reason for his Affirmation; expecting, as is common with him, to be believed without proof. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Eusebius seems rather to mention three Famines, the 1st in Claudius's 4th year, the 2d in his 9th, the 3d in his 10th. Our Monsieur says of the 1st of these, that it is to be refer'd to the 2d Year of Claudius, which may seem strange, partly because Dr. Hammond (with whom our Monsieur rarely agrees) refers it to that Year, partly because the Annales Paulini (which our Monsieur is wont to follow) refer it to the 4th Year of Claudius as
as Eusebius doth, yea Pagi also refers it to that Year.

According to Jof. Scaliger the Famine in Greece, of which Eusebius speaks was also throughout the world, and that Famine which was foretold by Agabus. But (says our Monsieur) he gives no reason for his Affirmation; expecting, as is common with him, to be believed without proof. To which I shall only say, If it was a fault in Jof. Scaliger to expect so often to be believed without proof, why do's our Monsieur imitate or rather go beyond him in it? for I do not know that Scaliger or any other Author is so much guilty of asserting things without proof, as our Monsieur is.
Of Monsieur Le Clerc's correcting the Sacred Text.

Our Monsieur having reflected upon the ancient Fathers, yea upon the Apostles and Penmen of Holy Writ, could not rest there; but would shew his Critical Art in correcting the Text of Scripture itself. How happy he is in it, we shall see in a few instances.

P. 105. in S. Mark 8. 24.

These words ὡς δέδηχα πετάλιαν make but a harsh construction, and I do not know but that the ancient reading was ὡς δέδηχα πεταλία, as trees that walk; and so the meaning of the blind man will be, that two sorts of objects presented themselves to him, whereof one stood still, viz. Trees; and another, which were also like Trees to his apprehension, walked. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

To this I say very briefly, 1. Our Monsieur, that can find Trees standing still in these
these words, *Men as Trees that walk*, has an Art above any that ordinary persons can pretend to. 2. There is no harsh construction in these words, *I see Men as Trees, walking*. 3. Suppose there was, I am sure that the words, which our Monsieur would substitute for them, *I see Men like walking-trees*, have but an harsh sense; for *walking-trees* are a great rarity.

P. 109. in S. Mark 10. 6.

The word *κλέως* not being in Beza's ancient Copy, nor in the Syriack, nor in the parallel place of S. Matthew, may justly be suspected. It is possible that some Transcriber thinking it not to be sufficient to say *καὶ τὸς αἰῶνα*, might add the word *κλέως*, to shew that the beginning of the World was spoken of. But this was needless, the beginning of the World being call'd *αἰῶν* by way of eminence as it were. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

I cannot imagine why our Monsieur is here so much displeas'd with the word *κλέως*. Doth it obscure the sense? No, it evidently makes for the clearing of it. Doth it make the construction harsh? The harshness of the construction was objected in the last
last Text, but it cannot be pretended here. Our Monsieur says that it is possible that some Transcriber might add it, to shew that the beginning of the World was spoken of. And so I might say, It is possible that some Transcriber might leave it out in S. Matthew, thinking (as our Monsieur doth) that ἀρχή alone is sufficient to denote the beginning of the World. But is, It is possible, a sufficient ground for correcting the Text either in S. Mark or S. Matthew? Our Monsieur urges that the word κόσμος is not in the parallel place of S. Matthew, and I grant it, but say that therefore S. Mark might think fit to add it to explain what beginning it was of which S. Matthew spake. He urges also, that the beginning of the World is call’d ἀρχή by way of Eminency; but I ask, Is ἀρχή (when nothing is added to it) always put for the beginning of the World, particularly is that the signification of it, S. Joh. i. 1. where it is said, In the beginning was ὁ λόγος? Our Monsieur seems to say that it is not; for in his Paraphrase on those words. p. 157. he says, that ὁ λόγος was before the Creation of the World. But the word κόσμος (says our Monsieur) is not in Beza’s Copy, which is true; but unless he had a greater esteem for that Copy himself, he should not press others with it. Besides, if here in v. 6. upon the authority of
that Copy we throw away μὴ ἔσω, we may also throw away ἀνδρὶ in the same verse, and ἀνδρὶς in v. 5, and διὰ δὲ εἰτὼν in v. 4, and ἐκ-σταλὲ φασιν in v. 3, and δὴ τῷ in v. 1; and so correct a great part of the Scripture away, for all these are wanting in that MS. Lastly, our Monsieur says, that it is not in the Syriack: To which I answer, 1. It is not unusual with the Syriack to omit words, as it also frequently adds. 2. The word for Beginning in the Syriack is בְּנֵי, which is near to בְּנֵי Gen. 1. 1, and so may mind us of the Creation without any thing added to it.

P. 242. in Act. 28. 23.

Οἰς ἐξελθέντων ἤμαρτομεν την βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, πειθὼν τῇ ἀνδρὶ τοῦ περὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ἐπὶ τῇ νόμῳ, &c. These words are displaced, and for the better understanding of them are to be read in this order. Οἰς ἐξελθέντων τῷ περὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ἤμαρτομεν την βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, πειθὼν τῇ ἀνδρὶ ἐπὶ τῇ νόμῳ, &c. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Our Monsieur doth not here alter the words, but he takes upon him to correct the Order of them, and this without producing
ducion the authority of any Copy either Printed or Manuscript to warrant it, and without giving any reason for his doing so, unless this must pass for a reason, that the placing the words in the Order which he recommends to us, will conduce to the better understanding them. But this I deny, and say that the sense of the words is clear enough without any such transposition of them. To whom he expounded the Kingdom of God testifying it, and persuading them of the things concerning Jesus, both out of the Law of Moses, and out of the Prophets. What can be more clear? And yet our Monsieur is so much in love with this correction, that he falls foul upon several Interpreters who have not translated according to it. He asks what exponebat testificans is in the Vulgar Translation. But he should have asked what exponebat testificans regnum Dei is, and then I should readily have told him, that it is He expounded the Kingdom of God, bearing testimony to it. The Geneva Translation he blames for rendering διαμαρτυρίας by par divers testinages, the Port-Royal for taking too great a liberty, Beza for not observing his transposition, the Vulgar, Erasmus and Castellio for omitting the Article τω. But in defence of these last it may be said, that this Article is wanting in the Alexandrian MS, and we
may believe, that it was wanting also in the Copies which they made use of, as it is in the Syriack and Æthiopick.

P. 579. in S. Jam. 3. 6.

When I read this place, I can hardly forbear thinking that a Gloss out of the Margin hath crept into the Context; and if it be cast out, both a useless repetition will be avoided, and the series of the discourse very proper thus, Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth; and so the Tongue is among our Members, which defileth the whole body, setting on fire the wheel of our Generation. As there is nothing wanting in this sentence, so there is nothing superfluous. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

This is the boldest stroke of all. According to our Monsieur there is in the Sacred Text an useless repetition, and (as he says afterward) words are unnecessarily interpos'd, words that signify the same thing, and have no coherence one with another, and all because of a Gloss that is crept out of the Margin into the Text; Thus our Monsieur. Before we can judge aright of that which he here says, it will be necessary to transcribe
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cribe the words of the Text, S. Jam. 3. 5, 6.

Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth. And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity: so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature, &c. I must acknowledge that I am not so clear-sighted as to see any useless repetition, or unnecessary interposition of words, which signify the same thing, and have no coherence one with another; and I cannot but admire that our Monsieur could have the confidence to mention the casting out those excellent words, The tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity, especially not having the authority of any ancient MS or Version to warrant it. But let us hear what our Monsieur has to say for himself.

First (says he) the word ἵνα shews that thence we must begin the ἀνάλογον of the comparison, as in the foregoing Similitudes, wherein the ἱνα is begun with the Particle ἵνα, and the ἀνάλογον with the Conjunction ἵνα, as it is here; Thus our Monsieur. But I answer, 1. The Alexandrian Manuscript, the Vulg. the Syriack and Ethiopic have not the Conjunction ἵνα, or any word that answers to it. 2. If we read ἵνα, it is not necessary that we begin the ἀνάλογον of the comparison thence. As to that which our Monsieur says concerning the
Animadversions upon

the foregoing Similitudes, we shall find (if we consult S. James) that they are only two, viz. one in v. 3, and the other in v. 4, and ἵδον is prefix'd to both of them; but there is not twice ἰτῶς, as there is twice ἵδον, but ἰτῶ v. 5. answers to both, and begins the ἄμαθεσις. So that our Monsieur's argument is this, ἰτῶ begins the ἄμαθεσις v. 5, and therefore ἰτῶ begins it v. 6; but I deny the consequence, for we must not deny S. James the liberty of varying the expression, if he thought fit to do it. And he do's it here, beginning the ἄμαθεσις not with ἰτῶ as v. 5, but with ξῆλ; and so the sense is plain, Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth, this is the ἰμοίρας; then follows the ἄμαθεσις, And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity; it is so set among the members, that (tho' it be but a little one) it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature.

3. However this Argument from ἰτῶ v. 5. can be of no validity if Dr. Hammond be in the right, for he will not allow that it is there a Note of the ἀμαθεσίας of the Similitude; and if any think that it is so, he judges that it is a mistake. See his Annotation on v. 5.

Secondly (says he) this expression The tongue is a fire, signifies the same with the whole Similitude, and the words A world of
of iniquity plainly spoil the connection of
the discourse; Thus our Monsieur. But I
deny both these, 1. The expression The
tongue is a fire, do's not signify the fame
with the whole Similitude; for the whole
Similitude is this, As a great matter is kin-
dled by a little Fire, so the tongue being a
fire, tho' it be but a little member, setteth
on fire the whole Course of Nature. 2. The
words a World of Iniquity, do not at all
spoil the Connexion of the Discourse, for
they are added to shew why the Tongue sets
on fire the whole Course of Nature, and also
defiles the whole Body, viz. because it is
a World of iniquity. Thus we have seen
what wonderful Reasons our Monsieur
gives for correcting the Sacred Text, and
casting out of it these excellent words, The
tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity.

S E C T. VI.

Of Monsieur Le Clerc's misrepresenting
Dr. Hammond's Words or Sense.

Our Monsieur's Reflections upon Dr. Ham-
mond are so many, that the Reader can scarce open to any place in his Sup-
plement, where they will not occur. Yet
Animadversions upon

if he had rested here, it had been more pardonable; but when not being satisfied here-with, he also misrepresents Dr. Hammond's words and sense, that he might make to himself occasions of reflecting upon him when he found none, I do not see what can be pleaded in excuse for him. And I shall give so many instances of his injurious dealing with Dr. Hammond in this respect, that if he know not how to blush, his friends (if he have any) will certainly blush for him.

P. 34. in S. Matth. 10. 9.

Our Author denies the words spoken by Jacob of himself, Gen. 32. to be declarative of his poverty. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Dr. Hammond do's not deny that Jacob's words are declarative of his poverty; he says most truly, that Jacob do's not affirm that he begg'd, but there is a manifest difference between not affirming that he was poor, and not affirming that he begg'd. A man may be poor, and yet not beg, not be a Mendicant. Our Monsieur presently after acknowledges this. His words are, Tho' it would be but ill infer'd from the nce that he went thither in the habit of a beggar. If there-
therefore he had given us Dr. Hammond's words, it would have appeared that the Doctor and he said the same thing. But Dr. Hammond must be mistaken, and our Monsieur could not have any colour for charging him with a mistake, but by substituting other words instead of his. But let it be suppos'd that Dr. Hammond had deny'd the words spoken by Jacob of himself, Gen. 31. 2. to be declarative of his poverty, where is the mistake? For tho' Jacob was comparatively poor when he pass'd over Jordan, i.e. not so rich as he was at his return; yet our Monsieur must confess that he was not absolutely poor, but had sufficient for his present condition.

P. 50. in S. Matth. 15. 7.

I do not think with Grotius and Dr. Hammond that there is any respect here had to a further second Accomplishment of a Prophecy of Isaiah. Thus Monsieur LeClerc.

Animadv.

Dr. Hammond hath not any Paraphrase or Note upon S. Matth. 15. v. 7, nor yet upon v. 8; he hath a Paraphrase upon v. 9, but in it there is not a word of a further second Accomplishment of any Prophecy.
In his Paraphrase upon the parallel place S. Mark 7. 6. he hath these words, You are the very sort of Hypocrites of which Isaiah prophesied, i.e. spake, (so our Monsieur expounds the word Prophezed in this very place.) and this is all.

P. 51. in S. Matth. 15. 22.

Qui subtius dividunt circumfundi Syria Phoenicem volunt, &c. where the word circumfundi signifieth to be contained or comprehended, not to be encompassed, as the Doctor and Pliny's Interpreter thought. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

How appears it that Dr. Hammond thought that circumfundi signifieth to be encompassed? he doth not translate it Encompassed, but Bounded. His words are, Affirm Phœnice to be bounded by Syria. But suppose that the Doctor had rendred circumfundi to be encompassed or environ'd (which he do's not) it might have been said that he follow'd the usual signification of the word; but if I should ask our Monsieur where circumfundo signifieth to be contain'd or comprehended, perhaps he would not readily produce instances of its being us'd
us'd so. As to that which our Monsieur urges, that Phænice is a part of Syria, Dr. Hammond had answer'd it, telling us that in some accounts it is part of it, viz. when Syria is taken in a more large sense, it is a part of it; but at other times it is distinguished from it, as in those words of Pliny, l. 5. c. 12. which our Monsieur alludes, Effe oram maritimam Syriæ cujus pars sit Idumæa & Judæa, deinde Phænice, deinde Syria. In these words Syria is taken in a twofold sense, according to the one Idumæa, Judæa and Phænice are parts of it, according to the other they are distinct from it.

P. 52. in S. Matth. 16. 13.

I should not think it at all strange if a Roman or Grecian Writer should say that Cæsarea was in Syria; because Palestine is reckoned by the Greeks and Romans a part of Syria. But a Christian that uses to follow the custom of the Scripture, which always makes a distinction between Syria and Canaan, would have spoken more accurately, if he had said that Cæsarea was in the Territory of the Tribe of Manasseh, on the West-side of Jordan in Palestine or Judea. But the contention between the Jews and the Syrians, which he afterwards mentions, was the reason doubtless why our Author thus spake.

Q. 3
Here our Monsieur would persuade us that Dr. Hammond makes Caesarea in the Territory of the Tribe of Manasseh, on the West-side of Jordan, to be in Syria, which he do's not, unless our Monsieur can certainly prove that Caesarea was in the Territory of that Tribe. I know that Adrichomius reckoneth it among the Cities of the half Tribe of Manasseh on this side Jordan, but the Terra sancta Descriptio in the Apparatus before our Polyglot, p. 48, makes it to be one of the Cities of Judea; not as Judea is taken in that large Sense in which our Monsieur takes it here when he confounds it with Palestine, but as it is distinguished from Samaria and the two Galilees. Josephus Antiq. I. 15. 13, says, that it is situate in Phœnice. This may suffice to shew, that it is not so certain (as our Monsieur makes it to be) that Caesarea was in the Tribe of Manasseh. We see also that Dr. Hammond had good authority for it, when he said that Caesarea was in Syria, for our Monsieur very lately told us that Phœnice is part of Syria. But perhaps our Critick will say that Josephus neither speaks accurately, nor as a Jew (who should have followed the custom of the Scripture of the
the Old Testament) but as a Roman or Græcian.

P. 56. in S. Matth. 16. 26.

Our learned Author is mistaken, for nothing is more common with all Writers than to join the Verb ζυγων with an Accusative Case. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad ver.

Every one that reads this in our Monsieur, and do’s not consult Dr. Hammond, will surely conclude that the Doctor denies that ζυγων is ever joyn’d with an Accusative Case; whereas he is so far from denying it, that he afferts it in opposition to some who thought that it was not very fitly joyn’d here with ζυγων as the Accusative Case govern’d by it. Take his own words, ζυγων (says he) is not thought to be very fitly joyn’d with ζυγων as the Accusative Case govern’d by it.——Yet may it be read with an Accusative Case following the Verb, as in that place of Agathias, &c. It is manifest that Dr. Hammond not only says that it may be read with an Accusative Case, but also gives an example of it, much more apposite than that which our Monsieur produces out of Dionysius Halicarn.; in which this
Animadversions upon

this Verb is joyn'd with an Accusative Case, but it is in a quite different sense. What can be said here in excuse of this, I know not, especially when our Monsieur repeats the injury in the very next Page (p. 57.) when he says, Besides the Doctor's Annotation is manifestly confuted by the parallel place in S. Luke 9. 25, where the phrase is ἐκυλοὶ κημωτείς, not ἔχειν ἔξωλον; Thus our Monsieur. In Dr. Hammond's Annotation it is said that τίν ἔ ὄχθις is thought to be instead of ἔχειν ἔ ὄχθις, and our Monsieur would persuade us that this was Dr. Hammond's opinion, and therefore he says The Doctor's Annotation is confuted by S. Luke 9. 25. But it was not the Doctor's opinion, it was Piscator's opinion, and perhaps the opinion of some others which the Doctor recites, but rejects. But let us suppose that Dr. Hammond was of this opinion, how doth our Monsieur refute it? It is manifestly confuted (says he) by S. Luke 9. 25, where the phrase is ἐκυλοὶ κημωτείς. But our Monsieur has got such an habit of misrepresenting, that he do's not rightly represent the sacred Text itself; for the phrase in S. Luke is ἐκυλοὶ ἐ ταλέσας κημωτείς; so that some may perhaps tell him that ἐκυλοὶ is governed of ταλέσας, not of κημωτείς, and our Translators and Montanus seem to have thought so. I may therefore
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fore conclude that Piscator's opinion is not so manifestly confuted by S. Luke, as our Monsieur pretends.

P. 66. in S. Matth. 18. 35.

This is all that can be concluded from this place; not as the Doctor and Grotius before him says, that Sins which are once pardoned in this life may be again charged upon a man. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Where Dr. Hammond says this, I do not know; he hath no Note upon this Text, and his words in his Paraphrase upon it are only these, By this resemblance ye see what measure ye must expect from God in this matter. For just so shall God deal with you, remit nothing of that rigour to you which you use against others, deal most severely with you, if you do not clearly, plenarily and sincerely (without any reseruation or design to have God execute any vengeance for you or the like) forgive all injuries how great soever (being certainly far below the proportion of yours against God) that are done to you by any man living. In this excellent Paraphrase there is not a word of that which our Monsieur imputes to Dr. Hammond, viz.
23.4. Animadversions upon

viz. that Sins which are once pardon'd in this life may be charged again upon Men.

As to Grotius, he only relates the various Opinions of the Ancients concerning the Question An peccata semel remissa iterum imputentur, he determines nothing.

P. 71. in S. Matth. 20. 16.

In that place of Aristotle, near the end of lib. 2. of his Oeconomicks, there is no connexion between ἡμικοιμεῖται Σατερᾶς and the word ἔχετος. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Doth Dr. Hammond say that there is a connexion between ἡμικοιμεῖται Σατερᾶς and the word ἔχετος? His words are these, *We find τεχνίτας ἔχετος subjunct to Σατερᾶς ἡμικοιμεῖται*; but this surely is far from saying that there is a connexion between ἡμικοιμεῖται Σατερᾶς and the word ἔχετος. Dr. Hammond connects ἔχετος with τεχνίτας. Our Monsieur says in the foregoing Page (p. 70.) I shall set down those things that seem to need correction, and it seems where he could find nothing that might seem to need correction, he resolved to substitute something which might. I shall only observe further, that our Monsieur would
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Would have these τεχνιτας to have been Fiddlers, or any other sort of Musicians, as if Aristotle could not have found a more proper word for Musicians than τεχνιτας. If Dr. Hammond had troubled the World with such ridiculous stuff as this, how severely would he have been lash'd!

P. 77. in S. Matth. 22. 31.

His supposing that the Sadduces Objection was designed as a Confirmation of their whole Doctrine, is without any ground. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

How appears it that Dr. Hammond do's suppose this? He says indeed that the Sadduces Objection proceeded against all future being, but he do's not say that it was designed as a confirmation of their whole Doctrine. If our Monsieur thinks that the denying all future being after this life was the whole Doctrine of the Sadduces, he is very much mistaken; for S. Luke Act. 23. 8, testifies, that they deny'd Angels and Spirits as well as the future Being of Men; and if our Monsieur consults Josephus Ant. l. 13. c. 9. and l. 18. c. 2. and de Bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 12, he will find other Doctrines of theirs
Animadversions upon theirs mention'd. Thus it is apparent that our Monsieur misrepresents Dr. Hammond in mentioning the whole Doctrine of the Sadduces, whereas the Doctor speaks only of their denying all future being; and also gives his reason why he supposed that the Sadduces Objection was designed against all future being, which our Monsieur hath not answered.

P. 78. in S. Matth. 22. 31.

It is a mistake that the words ἄνδρας ὑπάρχειν in this Phrase ἃνδρας ὑπάρχειν are of the Neuter Gender. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvice.

Where do's Dr. Hammond say that ὑπάρχειν in that Phrase is of the Neuter Gender? Do's he not say in so many words, that in this place (S. Matth. 22. 31.) ὑπάρχειν is the Masculine? Yea, he do's not only say, but prove it from the parallel place S. Luke 20. 37, which is one of the places that are produced by our Monsieur. So also he says, that ἃνδρας ὑπάρχειν is the re-subsistence or second state of Men, where the word Men plainly shews that he did not take ὑπάρχειν to be the Neuter. It is true that he says that when ἃνδρας is joined with ὑπάρχειν in the Neuter
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Neuter (as νεκρός signifies cadavera) it do's signify the Resurrection of the Body distinctly; but then he says expressly, that ἀνάγων τῷ νεκρῷ, S. Matth. 22. 31, doth not peculiarly signify the Resurrection of the Body. Also he doth not say that ἀνάγων is joyn'd with νεκρῷ in the Neuter in any place of the New Testament, he only supposed that possibly in some Author it might be joyn'd with it in that Gender.

P. 80. in S. Matth. 23. 27.

The Doctor contradicts himself while he endeavours to reconcile S. Luke and S. Matthew: For he tells us that the Sepulchres were call'd ὅπως ἐξειρήματι, because they were grown over with grass, and so were ἔξωμα indistinguishable from other ground. And yet in the mean while he affirms that they were whited over with Lime on purpose that they might be distinguish'd; whereas it was impossible that they should at the same time be ἔξωμα, because of their being covered with grass, and yet ἔξωμα by the grounds being daubed with Lime. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadu.

If Dr. Hammond say that the Sepulchers were distinguishable and undistinguishable, whited
whited over with Lime and so discernible, and grown over with grass, and so not discernible at the same time, it would not be easy to free him from self-contradiction. But do's the Doctor say so? Our Monfieur would persuade us that he doth, but it is certain that he doth not. The words At the same time are not his, but our Monfieur's, who interserted them for a reason which he very well knows. Dr. Hammond clearly distinguishes the time. In his Paraphrase on S. Matth. 23. 27, he says thus; It may fitly be resembled to Sepulchers, which are fain to be whited over, that they may be discerned to be such, and so avoided; being otherwise grown over with grass, and not discernible from other ordinary ground by the outside, S. Luke 11. 44. The Doctor here says plainly, that when they were whited over they were discernible, otherwise (i.e. when they were not whited) being grown over with grass they were not discernible from other ground by the outside. So far is Dr. Hammond from contradicting himself, or saying that the Sepulchers are distinguishable and undistinguishable at the same time.
P. 82. in S. Matth. 23. 35.

'Tis through a mistake said by our Author, that the High-Priest prostrated himself before the door of the Porch. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

'Tis through a mistake said by our Monsieur, that Dr. Hammond says this. The Doctor here makes not any mention of the High-Priest, or his prostrating himself; that which he says is of the other Priests; as will be manifest to any one that consults the Doctor. He also doth not say Before the door of the Porch, but Without it; and by the Door of the Porch, I suppose he meant no more than the Gate or Entrance of it.

P. 100. in S. Mark 5. 22.

The Judges and the Presidents of Ecclesiastical Assemblies, which our Author has forgot to observe, were called by the same name of ἀρχιερεῖς, because they were the same persons; for which see Camp.Virtinga de Synagog. I. 2. c. 9. But Dr. Hammond, in what follows, seems to confound a School
Dr. Hammond doth not seem to confound with בתי הדין, for he plainly makes the former to signify an house of information, or exposition of the Law; but the Consistory a place for resolving differences of the Law or (as otherwhere) a place of Judicature. So that it is apparent that the Doctor was far from confounding them. Having observ'd that the Schools were either more private, or more publick, he says indeed that the more publick were where the Consistories sat; but he do's not say that they were the Consistories.

Our Monsieur here forgot that Dr. Hammond says expressly that בתי יהוד' here (viz. S. Mark 5. 22.) signifies the lesser Consistory, and so he had no occasion to treat of the Rulers of Ecclesiastical Assemblies, and consequently our Monsieur had no reason to upbraid him with forgetting to speak of the Judges and Presidents of them. If he think that Dr. Hammond was obliged to transcribe into his Annotations all that our Monsieur has met with in Vitringa or other Writers, I suppose he is singular in his opinion.
P. 115. in S. Mark 14. 3.

_The Phrase_ pura nardus in Tibullus do's not signify, as the Doctor thinks, Ointment made only of Nard, or the Juice of Nard. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

**Animadvc.**

How appears it that Dr. Hammond thought that _pura nardus in Tibullus_ signifies Ointment made only of Nard, or the Juice of it? Explaining the word ἑκατον, and relating the various Opinions of Interpreters, at length he acquaints us that some laid that ἑκατον like ἔκαστος may signify sincere, unmixed, as it is commonly call'd pure Nard. _Pura distillant tempora Nardo in Tibullus._ Thus Dr. Hammond, making _pura nardo in Tibullus_ to signify nothing but Pure Nard. Of any Ointment in Tibullus, either made of the Juice of Nard only, or of Spices mixed with it, here is not a word.


_That the Phrase_ ἀπατεῖν τοῦ ἐκτοῦ signif-ies to require Usury, or ἐκτοῦ by it self to receive upon Use, I am not apt to believe, if those words be considered conjunctly. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
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Animadv.

Who says either of these, either that ἀπαιτεῖν τὸ εαυτοῦ signifies to require Usury, or that ἄριστι signifies to receive upon Use? Not Dr. Hammond, whom our Monsieur had in his eye. He renders ἄριστι here to receive upon Loan, in place of which our Monsieur substitutes to receive upon Use; he makes ἀπαιτεῖ here to signify to require Usury, but our Monsieur represents it as if he had said that ἀπαιτεῖν τὸ εαυτοῦ had signified so; whereas Dr. Hammond makes not any mention of that Phrase. But our Monsieur could not deny that which the Doctor alleges that ἀπαιτεῖ in the LXX, and otherwise signifies to exact Usury, and so after his manner he puts something else instead of it.

P. 133. in S. Luke 8. 3.

He is mistaken whoever thinks with Dr. Hammond, that the Verb διακοσμῖν signifies this particular action (viz. of distributing the Meats at Feasts) rather than any other service. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Dr. Hammond was so far from thinking this, that he says plainly that the word is frequently taken in general for any kind of service or ministry, adding that this is the ordinary notion of it; only he thought it not amiss to consider the word as it refers to one particular Office of Servants, that of waiting at Feasts.

P. 149. in S. Luke 21. 4.

*It is false that δεικνυται and γαζοφυλακοι are the same.* Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Where do's Dr. Hammond say that they are the same? he only says that δεικνυται here (v. 4.) is used for γαζοφυλακοι v. 1; even as our Monsieur himself confesses that βαλλειν εις γαζοφυλακοι and βαλλειν εις δεικνυται are all one as to the sense.

P. 152. in S. Luke 22. 52.

*It may be demanded why the Captain of the Guard of Levites is called φαρμακος, which properly signifies a Military Captain and Com-
Animadversions upon command, whereas the Levites were no Soldiers. And this is undoubtedly the reason why Dr. Hammond thought it was the Tribune who was set over the Roman Garrison that was called by that name. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Here our Monsieur misrepresents both Dr. Hammond's Opinion and his Reason. As to the Doctor's Opinion, how appears it that he thought it was the Tribune who was set over the Roman Garrison, who is called ρατίνης? The Doctor has not the word Tribune, he calls him the Captain or Commander, but never the Tribune; and he was very prudent in it, for our Monsieur, who a little before says that the Garrison put into the Tower call'd Antonia had a Roman Tribune for its Captain, will perhaps find it a difficult task to prove it. As to Dr. Hammond's Reason why he thought that he was a Roman Commander that is called ρατίνης, our Monsieur says that undoubtedly it was, because ρατίνης properly signifies a Military Commander, whereas the Levites were no Soldiers. But notwithstanding all this confidence, if he had attentively read Dr. Hammond, he would have found that this was not the reason. For the
the Doctor observes that some Priests are call'd מַשְׁפַּד by Josphus, and surely the Priests were no Soldiers if the Levites were not; and therefore it is apparent that this is not the reason of Dr. Hammond's thinking that Levites are not to be understood by מַשְׁפַּד.

P. 197. in S. Joh. 8. 29.

That in Latin the phrase Placita Principium, and Arrests of Parliament among the French, signify any thing but the Decrees of both, no body would say that would not be guilty of an intolerable impropriety of speech, which is a thing the Doctor never scrupled. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadu.

Dr. Hammond's words are these, The word ἀρχηγὸς in common use signifies the decree or appointment of any Court, or Judge, or Prince; so the Principum placita among the Romans, the Arrests of the Parliament at Paris, &c. among the French. Doth the Doctor here say that Placita Principum, and the Arrests of Parliament, do signify anything but the Decrees of both? If they did not signify their Decrees, they would not serve the Doctor's purpose, which is
To illustrate this, that ἀφεγερτά signified the Decree of any Court, or Judge, or Prince. So (says he) the Principum placita among the Romans, i.e. the Principum placita (placita being the same with ἀφεγερτά) signified the Decrees of Princes. And so (says he) the Arrests of the Parliament of Paris, &c. among the French, i.e. the Arrests of Parliament signify the Decrees of Parliament. Thus our Monsieur represents Dr. Hammond as saying the direct contrary to that which he doth say, and not satisfied with this injury, he objects to him an intolerable impropriety of Speech. But if the Doctor was really guilty of an impropriety of Speech (as he here is not) it is more pardonable than that intolerable rudeness of language, which is a thing that our Monsieur never scruples.


Our Author misrepresents Pausanius, as saying the Lydians and Persians; whereas his words are, The Lydians surnamed Persians. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. Our Monsieur misrepresents Dr. Hammond, for he do's not say The Lydians and Persians.
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Persians, but *The Lydians or Persians*, which is the same as to the sense with *Lydians* or named Persians.

P. 261. in *Rom. 3. 4.*

Dr. Hammond doth ill compare the *Phrases* to be imputed to Righteousness, and to be accounted worthy of a reward, with one another. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

**Animadw.**

Dr. Hammond doth not at all compare those two Phrases. His words are these, That which is express'd *Rom. c. 4. v. 4.*, by it was accounted for Righteousness, is *v. 5.*, the reward was reckoned. So that instead of *The reward was reckoned*, our Monsieur substitutes *To be accounted worthy of a reward*. Whereas there is a great difference between these two, for the reward may be reckoned *v. 4.* of grace or favour to him that is not accounted worthy of it.

P. 278. in *Rom. 8. 23.*

Our Author forgot himself when he wrote this, for we do not find this word *σωτήριον* used in the 22d Verse. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

**R 4.**

**Ani-**
It will appear that our Monsieur here most strangely forgot himself, for Dr. Hammond doth not say that the word γέναυς is used in v. 22; and if our Monsieur had been fully awake when he read him, he would have perceived it. It is the word Groan, of which the Doctor says very truly that it is used v. 22, but in a different sense from that in which we use it when we say that heavy pressures make the body groan.

P. 287. in Rom. 10.5.

Our Author says in his Paraphrase, that it was impossible the Law should be observed. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

They that shall please to read Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase, will find that he says no such thing.

P. 315. in 1 Cor. 5.10.

Our Author speaks as if the Greeks and Romans did very freely suffer their Wives and Children to be corrupted or prostituted in
in their sacred Mysteries; and as if that was the general Custom, than which nothing can be more false. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Dr. Hammond says not a word of the Greeks and Romans suffering their Wives to be corrupted and prostituted, much less of their suffering this freely, and of its being the general custom. He speaks indeed of Virgins being prostituted among the Babylonians, and the prostituting Men and Women noted in Isaiah, and of the mention of the prostitution of their Daughters in Herodotus and Strabo; but that the Greeks and Romans very freely suffer’d the prostitution of their Wives, there is not the least intimation.

P. 329. in 1 Cor. 9. 25.

The place in Aelian is absurdly thus quoted by our Author. So Aelian of the Tarentinus Luctator; as if the Luctator’s name had been Tarentinus. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Dr. Hammond's meaning is here most absurdly misrepresented by our Monsieur. If the
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the Doctor had thought that Tarentinus
had been the Luctator's name; he would
have express'd it thus, So Aelian of Ta-
rentinus the Luctator; but when he says
Of the Tarentinus Luctator, it most clear-
ly shews that he did not take Tarentinus
to be his name.

P. 329. in 1 Cor. 9. 25.

Our Author erroneously thought that the
word πᾶντα, in this place of S. Paul is go-
vern'd by the Verb εὐγενικῶς. Thus
Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

How appears it that Dr. Hammond
thought so? Doth he say that πᾶντα is go-
vern'd by εὐγενικῶς? Or doth he say any
thing else from which it may be certainly
concluded that he thought so? If he do's
neither of these (as it is manifest that he
doth neither of them) our Monsieur hath
too hastily (after his manner) imputed
this to him.

P. 332. in 1 Cor. 10. 1.

That they (i.e. the miraculous passage of
the Israelites through the Red Sea, and the
Cloud
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Cloud going before them) are to be look'd upon as a tacit Declaration from the Israelites to yield obedience to God, I should hardly grant. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

And we shall hardly believe that Dr. Hammond is guilty of such Nonsense as this, tho' our Monsieur would persuade us that he is. The Doctor's words are these, That covering them with the Cloud, and environing them with the Sea, being on God's part the receiving them under his protection, to bring them safe to Canaan, and so to perform to them his part of the Covenant; and on their part an obligation to be for ever obedient to God. Thus Dr. Hammond.

P. 332. in 1 Cor. 10. 1.

All others are meer Trifles and Niceties, and have no more truth in them than that which our Author says about the Cloud environing the Israelites on every side, or the Seas being divided in the form of a Semi-circle. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
I would know where it is that Dr. Hammond says any thing about the Seas being divided in the form of a Semicircle. If he say that the Cloud environed the Israelites on every side, our Monsieur might have seen that he is not the first that hath said it, for Dr. Hammond rightly cites Pirke R. Eliezer c. 4, where R. Zachariah saith that the pillar of the Cloud encompassed the Camp of Israel as a Wall environed a City.

P. 345. in 1 Cor. 12. 2.

Our Author's Paraphrase of this Verse is intolerable; for the Heathens did not believe that their Idols spake of themselves, or that their Priests answer'd them of their own heads, but were both moved by the Gods. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

Is it either expressly said or clearly imply'd in Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase, that the Heathens did believe that their Idols spake of themselves, or that their Priests answer'd them of their own heads? If it be not, why doth our Monsieur go about to
to persuade the Reader that it is, or how can he say that the Paraphrase is intolerable upon that account? The words of the Paraphrase are these, *When ye were Heathens, ye know the Oracles pretended to foretell things to come, and by your desire to know such things ye were seduced to Idols, which were so far from being able to prelaze, that they were not able to speak; and the answers that were given you there, were neither given you by the Idols nor their Priests, but by the Devil in them.* What is there in this Paraphrase that implies that the Heathens believed those things which our Monsieur says they did not believe? *I confess (says our Monsieur here) Dr. Hammond had Grotius to go before him,* but could either Grotius or Dr. Hammond think that the Priests persuaded the Heathens that they gave the answer of their own heads? Most certainly the Priests pretended the quite contrary that they were moved or inspired by some God, tho' really the Answers were given by the Devil, as Grotius and Dr. Hammond say.

P. 368. in 2 Cor. 2. 11.

*I cannot tell whether Dr. Hammond had not also some such thoughts about this place, because he paraphrases it as if the Apostle had*
Animadversions upon

bad said for we are ignorant of his devices

Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

The Apostle says, *We are not ignorant of his devices*, and yet our Monsieur would persuade us that Dr. Hammond paraphrases it so, as if the Apostle had said the contrary, *We are ignorant of his devices*. But how appears this? the Doctor paraphrases it thus, *Satan hath many hidden secret arts to mischief Souls which we think not of, as if he had said We are not ignorant of it, but know very well, that Satan has many secret arts to mischief Souls which we think not of*. This is plainly his meaning, but our Monsieur wrests his Paraphrase to another sense; and not content with that, will needs suppose that Dr. Hammond entertain’d such extravagant thoughts about the word Satan here, as he himself doth. Our Monsieur imagines that by Satan in this place we are to understand a Man who was enemy to the Corinthian Church, rather than the Devil. But Dr. Hammond was far from harbouring any such strange conceit: this will be manifest to any one that shall consult his Paraphrase upon this Verse.
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P. 374. in 2 Cor. 7. 8.

He should not have said indefinitely that the Greeks used the word ἐκ to signify a short space of time. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. Dr. Hammond doth not say this indefinitely which our Monsieur makes him say. All that he says is, that both in Greek and Latin it is oft used for a small or short space.

P. 378. in 2 Cor. 9. 8.

Our Author interprets what S. Paul here says that God was able to do, so as if he had said he would certainly do it; and thence he infers that riches are promised to the liberal, even under the Gospel. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. Dr. Hammond's words in his Paraphrase are these, God is able (and having oft promised it, is sure to make it good) to make you the richer by your Liberality. We therefore see that the Doctor enclosed these words concerning the certainty of God's doing it in a Parenthesis, to shew that S: Paul did not say in express words that God would certainly do it, but by those words he
he is able to do it, encouraged them to believe that he would also do it. But howsoever it may be as to this, that which our Monsieur adds is utterly false, viz. that hence Dr. Hammond infers that riches are promised to the liberal even under the Gospel. For the Doctor's words are, Having oft promised, it is sure to make it good; so that it is manifest that he infer'd this, that God had promised plenty to the liberal and charitable, not from this but from several other places of Scripture; and then from God's having promised it, he infers the certain performance of the thing promised; viz. that he would bless Men's liberality, and make plenty to be consequent to the exercise of it.

P. 402. in Gal. 3. 1.

The Allusion which Dr. Hammond supposes the Apostle here might have to the name of Ebionites is vain: for it is not true that their name signifies folly. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Where do's Dr. Hammond say that the name of the Ebionites signifies folly? he says in express words quite otherwise, that
the name of *Ebion* signifies poor. He also alludes *Eusebius* observing that their name was given them from the Hebrew word which signifies poor, because of the poverty of their understanding, they being very silly Men. Our Monsieur also is not pleased with Dr. Hammond's supposing that the Apostle alludes to the name of the *Ebionites*, but he should have observ'd that the Doctor do's not say any thing positively about it. If (says he) the time would agree, 'tis not improbable that it should refer to the Heresy of the Ebionites, and again he makes it uncertain whether the Original of that Heresy was so early as that it might be taken notice of by this Apostle, and lastly he hath those words, Perhaps by this time known title. These words Perhaps, and 'Tis uncertain; and If the time would agree, plainly shew how far Dr. Hammond is from saying positively, that the Apostle here did allude to the name of the *Ebionites*.

P. 430. in Ephes. 4. 16.

*I cannot tell what made our Author think that the Genitive ἑξεργήφθη was in the place of οὐδενίσαμεν.* Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Animadversions upon

Animadv.

I cannot tell what made our Monsieur imagine that Dr. Hammond thought that ἑσπερίας was in the place of οὐδὲνοις, since in his Annotation there is nothing that looks that way, yea the Doctor gives a quite different account of it.

P. 437. in Ephes. 5. 30.

Our Author here compares together things that have no agreement with one another, for to be of Christ's Flesh and Blood is not to be Christ himself, as that which is called the Heaven and Earth is the very Universe. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

But where doth Dr. Hammond compare to be of Christ's Flesh and Blood with the Heaven and Earth so, that as that which is called the Heaven and Earth is the very Universe, so to be of Christ's Flesh and Blood is to be Christ himself? They that consult the Doctor will find that his Comparison is far distant from this. As (says he) the Heaven and the Earth are put for the World, so Christ his Flesh and Bones here
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Here signify no more than himself; and so the whole importance of the Verse is, that we are members of Christ, and nothing else: Thus Dr. Hammond.

P. 446. in Phil. i. i.

Our Author affirms, that after Vespasian had brought a Colony into Cæsarea, that City became immediately, even in respect of Ecclesiastical Government, a Metropolis. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

Here our Monsieur cunningly thrusts in the word Immediately, which is not in Dr. Hammond; he do's not say It became immediately, but It became also in respect of the Ecclesiastical Government a Metropolis. But our Monsieur slyly interverting the word Immediately, which (as he supposes) must signify In the time of Vespasian, expects that his Reader should believe that Dr. Hammond says that Cæsarea was a Metropolis in respect of the Ecclesiastical Government in the time of Vespasian: And now he thinks he has got advantage enough against the Doctor, and accordingly triumphs over him; whereas the Doctor, tho' he says from Pliny that

S 2 a Colony
Animadversions upon a Colony was brought thither by Vespasian, yet do's not say that it was a Metropolis in respect of the Ecclesiastical Government in the time of that Emperour, but only that it became such; how early he do's not say.

P. 459. in Phil. 3. 20.

No one would say, besides Dr. Hammond who abounds with improprieties of Speech, our privilege of Citizenship is in Heaven. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Who is there that reads this, and do's not consult Dr. Hammond, who would not believe that these words, Our privilege of Citizenship is in Heaven, are Dr. Hammond's; and yet no such words are to be found either in his Paraphrase or Annotation. He says in his Paraphrase that all Christians have the right of Citizens, and in his Annotation that the Christian is a Free-man of Heaven, but this is all. Our Monsieur adds that πολίτευμα here is all one with πόλις City, that is, Patria Country, which words I do not understand, for I am not satisfied that the City and the Country are the same, tho' I know that
it may be truly said both that our City and
our Country is above. As to that which
he says that πολίτιθμα is here all one with
πόλις, I should not have much disliked it,
if he had produced some other places where
the word is so used. The Ἐθιοπικ Interpreter seems to have thought that it is
here put for πόλις, for he hath rendred
the place Our City is in Heaven.

P. 474. in Col. 4. 17.

Grotius, who is followed therein by our
Author, thinks that there is a Hebraism in
these words for, see that thou fulfil in the
Lord the ministry which thou haft received;
so that the phrase in the Lord should signify
according to the precepts of the Lord.
Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

But Dr. Hammond hath nothing of all
this, yea he seems to make In the Lord
to refer, not to Fulfil but to Received, and
the sense to be Received from the Lord.
For the words of the Text, Take heed to
the Ministry which thou haft received in
the Lord, that thou fulfil it, he interprets
thus, Be careful to discharge that trust duly
which from Christ is committed to thee.

S 3

Here
Here then our Monsieur doubly injures Dr. Hammond. 1. In making him to say that which he do's not. 2. In laying that he borrows from Grotius.

P. 486. in 1 Thes. 5. 1.

Our Author supposes that a constant Faith and holy Life would be an infallible means to preserve the Christians, which as I acknowledge to be most true, understood of eternal Salvation, so I do not believe it true, if understood of a deliverance from the Persecutions of the Romans. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadver. Our Monsieur would persuade us that Dr. Hammond speaks either of eternal Salvation (and then that which he says is acknowledged to be true) or of a deliverance from the Persecutions of the Romans, and then it is affirmed to be false. But perhaps in the words which our Monsieur hath respect to, the Doctor speaks of neither of them. The words are these, And nothing but constancy and purity be likely to preserve any from that heavy destruction. Dr. Hammond here speaks neither of eternal Salvation, nor of deliverance from the Perse-
Persecutions of the Romans, but of the being preserved from that heavy destruction which would suddenly surprize the enemies of God.

P. 543. in Heb. 5. 2.

It is not to be thought with Dr. Hammond, that the Apostolical Writer of this Epistle speaks here so, as if no Sacrifice at all were admitted, but for Sins that proceeded from meer ignorance. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

How appears it that Dr. Hammond thought thus? He is so far from saying that no Sacrifices were admitted but for Sins that proceeded from meer ignorance, that he expressly mentions other Sins. The words of his Paraphrase are these, Which he offers for the sins of the people, those which they commit without deliberation, through ignorance, surréption or sudden passion.

P. 547. in Heb. 6. 6.

Meroùa is no where in the Holy Scriptures taken for those Church-Penalties which were imposed
imposed upon Penitents before they were admitted again to Communion. Our Author should have produced but one place to make himself believed. Thus Monsieur LeClerc.

Animadv.

Where doth Dr. Hammond say that μετανοια is taken for Church-Penalties? He says that it is sometimes taken for admission to pardon, adding that this is according to Scripture-Style, where to preach repentance is to proclaim admission to pardon upon repentance. He says also that it is sometimes taken for the whole proceeding of the Church with the Penitent, in order to his absolution from the Censures; thus Dr. Hammond. We see then that according to him, not the Censures or Church-Penalties, but the proceeding of the Church in order to absolution from them is sometimes signified by μετανοια. I cannot but take notice that our Monsieur here blames Dr. Hammond for citing the 52 Canon of the Neocæsarean Council, for (says he) there are only 15 Canons in all of that Council. But he might have observed that this was the fault of the Printer. Dr. Hammond undoubtedly had writ the VIIth, and the careless Printer put the Figure 5 instead of the Letter V, and then added the Figure 2.
P. 552. in Heb. 7. 27.

This he did once.] This is not to be understood so as if Christ had offered not only for the sins of the People, but also for his own, as Grotius and Dr. Hammond understood it. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvc.

I shall transcribe Dr. Hammond's words. By his death upon the Cross he both offered for himself, i.e. made expiation as it were, not to deliver himself from sin, for he was never guilty of any, but from the infirmities assumed by him, especially from death itself. With what forehead can our Monsieur say that Dr. Hammond understood it so as if Christ offer'd not only for the sins of the People, but also for his own, when the Doctor says so expressly that it was not to deliver himself from sin, and adds this as the reason, that he was never guilty of sin?

P. 570. in Heb. 13. 15.

It is utterly false that Holocausts could be look'd upon as a banquet over and above the prescribed Feast. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Animadversion upon

The words A banquet over and above the prescribed Feast are not Dr. Hammond's, but these A banquet over and above the prescribed Sacrifice, for (as the Doctor adds) as it is the custom after a Feast to serve in fruit; so (says Bartenorius) after they have offered the due Oblations of every day, they bring the Holocausts for their Free-will-offerings; Thus Dr. Hammond. By this it appears that our Monsieur misrepresents both the Doctor's words and sense, making him to speak of the Holocausts, which were the daily Sacrifices never to be omitted, when the Doctor speaks of those Holocausts which they brought as their Free-will-offering, after they had offered the prescribed Sacrifice.

P. 570. in Heb. 13. 15.

He is certainly mistaken in thinking the Septuagint used the single word ξαραφας, only because it yielded the same sense with ξαραφας. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Animadv.

How appears it that Dr. Hammond thought thus? His words are only these, Mr. Pocock renders another account of it, viz. that καρπὸς is here taken in the notion of καρπῶν. Here, 1. There is not the word only. It is not said that the LXX used the word καρπὸς only for the reason mention'd. 2. Dr. Hammond only relates the account which Mr. Pocock had given of the expression The fruit of the lips. 3. He mentions two other accounts of that expression, and I do not find that he approves of any one of them more than the other two. So that as to that which our Monsieur says that the Doctor is certainly mistaken, it comes to this, that he is certainly mistaken in thinking that which he did not think. And as to Mr. Pocock, he goes no further than thus, Quære an non καρπὸς idem hic valere possit ac καρπῶν; he do's not assert positively that it doth. I mention Mr. Pocock, because it is to be feared, that our Monsieur here reflects upon that excellently learned and modest person, when he says that some have spoiled their judgment with continual reading Arabick and Rabbinical Trifles. I am sure that he (i.e. our Monsieur) deserves to be severely reflected upon for it, but I forbear.

P. 570.
P. 570. in Heb. 13. 15.

He is mistaken in thinking that is Praise expressed with the Mouth. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Whence do's our Monsieur gather that Dr. Hammond thought thus? Is it from hence that the Doctor says that the fruit of the lips is here set down as all one with the sacrifice of praise, and that the sacrifice of praise is literally ?יְבֵיהַ חוֹרָה? If so, he ought to have considered that the Doctor do's not make the fruit of the lips to be only Praise express'd with the Mouth, for he expressly affirms it to be the payment of their Vows; and as to the Hebrew phrase יְבֵיהַ חוֹרָה Psal. 116. 17, he says that it is the salvation v. 13, that is, the peace-offering or trespass-offering, Levit. 7.

P. 585, in 1 Pet. 1. 2.

I wonder at Dr. Hammond, who compares ὑπακοή and ἰσθομένων with one another, as if they were both joined with ἄμωμος ἵππος Ἱρών, and were taken in a Passive sense. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Animad*.

Surely we may wonder much more at our Monsieur, when we find that Dr. Hammond doth neither of these. He neither makes both those words to be joined with ἀμελέω, nor to be taken in a Passive sense. He do's indeed say of the latter, viz. ἐπταξιών, that it must be taken in a Passive sense; and our Monsieur not only allows of this, but also contends for it: but as to ἐπταξιών, he hath not a word to this purpose. The thing is clear, and none but our Monsieur could have misrepresented it so strangely.

P. 596. in 1 Pet. 5. 3.

No body ever said that Shepherds, properly so called, are τῶν of the Sheep, when he going before, they follow him, except Dr. Hammond. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad*.

No man, except our Monsieur, would have affirm'd that Dr. Hammond says this. The Doctor's words are these, The Apostle commands the Bishops to rule them as Pastors do a flock, going before and so conducting them, which is here the meaning of τῶν ἔνδω-
Animadversions upon

τὰ ποιμήνες, becoming examples of the flock. Here the words Going before and so conducting them, do not refer to the word Pastors, but to the Bishops; they must go before and so conduct their flocks. That this is so, is evident from the next words, Which is here the meaning of τῦτοι γνώμενοι τὰ ποιμήνες, which are S. Peter’s words here, (viz. 1 Pet. 5. 3.) and in them γνώμενοι refers to the Elders v. i, that is (says Dr. Hammond) the Bishops; and consequently the Elders or Bishops were to be τῦτοι, both according to S. Peter’s meaning, and also according to Dr. Hammond’s, who only declaring the Apostle’s meaning in the fore-mention’d words, must needs speak of the same persons that he doth, i.e. not of Pastors in the literal sense, but of spiritual Pastors.

P. 599.

This I had rather say, than deny there is any mention here made of the last judgment, as Dr. Hammond do’s with the greatest confidence. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Here, according to our Monsieur, Dr. Hammond in his Premonition to the Second Epistle
Epistle of S. Peter, denies that in that Epistle there is any mention of the last Judgment; whereas the Doctor says in express words, that there is one passage which refers to the end of the World, ch. 3. v. 7. If our Monsieur should say that the end of the World in Dr. Hammond is not the same with the last Judgment, this very Text (viz. 2 Pet. 3. 7.) will confute him; for in it there is express mention of the Day of Judgment, in which, as the Doctor says, the World shall be destroyed by fire; see both his Paraphrase and Annotation. But if the Doctor so plainly says this, viz. that in the second Epistle of S. Peter mention is made of the end of the World or the last Judgment, how comes it that our Monsieur makes him to deny it, and that with the greatest confidence? All the defence that can be made for him is, that he misunderstood Dr. Hammond's words immediately preceding those which I have transcribed. And (says the Doctor) for the only proof of that taken from hence, that the Author of this Epistle arms his Readers with patience in expectation of the last Day, that is as far from truth also, there being no word in this Epistle to that matter. Our Monsieur understood that by That matter, the Doctor meant the last Day; whereas he meant by it the arming his Readers with patience
patience in expectation of that Day; of this (says Dr. Hammond) there is no word in this Epistle.

P. 609. in 2 Pet. 3. 4.

I know our Author thinks there are two Objections in this Verse. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

How do's our Monsieur know this? Doth Dr. Hammond say that there are two Objections? He is so far from saying this, that his words in his Paraphrase of v. 8. fully manifest that he thought that there was but one Objection; only he made that one Objection to have two parts. This answer (says he) being given to the latter part of the Atheist's Objection v. 4. I now proceed to answer the former part.

P. 613. in 2 Pet. 3. 10.

It is the greatest absurdity imaginable, because the ὅρια are in the starry Heaven, to say that that word signifies what is in the Air, the Clouds, Birds, &c. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
It will be sufficient here to transcribe Dr. Hammond's words; The word Heavens (says he) being used either for the Superior Heavens, whether Empyreal or Ethereal, or for the sublunary Heavens the Air, we may here resolve that ἡ cầuσια and σύρξα, the Heavens and the Host, or Elements thereof, are literally, the sublunary aereal Heavens, and all that is therein, Clouds, Meteors, Fowls, &c. Or if it be understood of the Ethereal Heavens, and the Planets or Signs therein, it will then be parallel to the Sun, Moon and Stars, S. Matth. 24. 29; Thus! Dr. Hammond. I appeal now to any person whatsoever, whether the Doctor be guilty of this absurdity, Because the σύρξα are in the starry Heaven, to say that that word signifies what is in the Air, the Clouds, Birds, &c.

P. 620. in 1 John 5. 6.

As for his saying that tho' the Alexandrian and many other ancient Manuscript Copies omit the 7th Verse, yet it is read in many other Manuscripts, and all the printed Copies except one. Thus Monsieur LeClerc.
Animadversions upon

Animadv.

Here our Monsieur is guilty both of adding and diminishing. When he says The Alexandrian, and many other ancient Manuscript Copies, Dr. Hammond hath only The King's Manuscript and many other Copies, so that here the words ancient Manuscript are added; and when Dr. Hammond says A great part of these two Verses is left out, our Monsieur hath only Omit the 7th Verse.

P. 634. in Rev. 2. 4.

What our Author says here about Elxai out of Eusebius. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

Dr. Hammond here says nothing at all about Elxai out of Eusebius. It is out of Epiphanius that he speaks of Elxai.

P. 635. in Rev. 3. 14.

Is there then any difference between μεγαλωμαι and μεγαι μαβλου? none certainly. But these are the false and vain subtleties of I know not whom, which our Author co-
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collected on this Chapter. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadu.

Where do's Dr. Hammond make any difference between μεγάλομασθύεα and μέγαν μάσθυεα? It is between μεγάλομασθύεα and ὁ μέγας μάσθυε that he makes the difference. Great and Noble Men (says he) were called μεγάλομασθύεα, but the Title of ὁ μέγας μάσθυε was reserved for Christ. And certainly every one that do's not wilfully shut his eyes, sees a real difference between these, and that this is not a false and vain subtlety.

P. 647. in Rev. 11. 3.

One is, that John was at Ephesus, or somewhere near it, when Timothy was left there by S. Paul. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadu.

Dr. Hammond doth not say that S. John was at Ephesus, or near it, when Timothy was left there by S. Paul. All that he says is, that John continued over the former, viz. the Jews, when Timothy was by Paul made Bishop at Ephesus over the latter, i.e. the Gentiles.
P. 653. in Revel. 13. 17.

What follows, &c. he took, for the most part, out of Grotius, but excepting these words, of these Servius and Virgil makes frequent mention. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadver.

To this the Translator here says, Perhaps it may be so printed in that Edition of Dr. Hammond which Mr. Le Clerc used; but in the second Edition it is, of these Servius on Virgil, &c. Thus the Translator. And I grant that it is some excuse to our Monsieur that it is so printed in one Edition Servius and Virgil; so that, tho' Dr. Hammond is here misrepresented, I do not impute it wholly to him: But I add, that it excuses him only in part, because he might so easily have perceived that it was a false Print. For, 1. These words Servius and Virgil makes are not true English, the Doctor would have said Servius and Virgil make. 2. If the Doctor had intended to joyn Virgil with Servius, he would not have said Servius and Virgil, but Virgil and Servius upon him, or the like. 3. Dr. Hammond had Grotius now before him, who doth not joyn Virgil with Servius, and as (if our Monsieur
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Monsieur represent him aright) he follow'd Grotius in the greatest part of what he says here, so he might have thought that he follow'd him here, as he really did.

P. 657. in Revel. 13. 18.

As he rashly affirmed that the Greeks in that Age were not acquainted with this way of expressing a name by the number of the Letters, so without reason he attributes the invention of it to the Rabbins. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

The Translator hath observed before me that our Monsieur hath here misrepresented Dr. Hammond. His words which he hath interserted in a different Character are these, It should seem by this, that Mr. Le Clerc misunderstood Dr. Hammond, for the Doctor do's not say as he represents him that the custom of expressing Names by Numbers was not known at that time among the Greeks, but that it was not ordinary among them, and that it was very usual among the Rabbins of that Age. Thus the Translator.

T 3 P. 665.
P. 665. in Rev. 20. 5.

He will never persuade any one who believes that Christ and his Apostles were the only arbitrary Founders and Interpreters of the Christian Religion, that for 1000 Years after Constantine the Church was purer than it was before; or that there were fewer false Doctrines by publick Authority established in many Churches. Thus Monfaier Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

Dr. Hammond do's not go about to persuade any one of this. His words are, The Church was for that space freed from such Heathen persecutors, and purified from such avowed mixtures of those vile unchristian practices.

P. 666. in Rev. 20. 8.

It is true indeed that Gyges was sometime Ruler of Lydia; but the Kings that succeeded him were not therefore, as I remember, called Gyges; tho' it be affirmed by Grotius, and after him by Dr. Hammond who absurdly deduces it from this place. Thus Monfaier Le Clerc.
Animadw.

Dr. Hammond only says that the Princes of Lydia are called Gygæ, which is lightly deduced from hence: His meaning is that Gygæ is lightly deduced from Gog. Our Monsieur changes the Doctors words, and instead of From hence puts From this place, and then by this place understands this place in the Revelation, viz. Rev. 20. 8.; and by this wonderful artifice he would persuade us that Dr. Hammond deduces the name Gyge from this place. And now he thinks he hath advantage enough against him, and fails not to chastise him very severely.

P. 666. in Rev. 20. 7.

He takes it for certain that not only Alaricus spared the Christians, and destroyed none but Heathens, but also that Gensericus and Attila did the same. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadw.

Dr. Hammond's words are these, After that the Emperours were Christians, Heathenism still continued in Rome, and in
Animadversions upon

the Empire in some degree, till by the com-
ing of the Goths, Vandals and Hunnes,
under Alaricus, Gensericus and Attilas, the
City and Empire of Rome was all the Hea-
then part of it destroyed, and Christianity
fully victorious over it. Every one sees
that here is a great difference both as to
Words and Sense, between that which the
Doctor really says, and that which our
Monfieur makes him to say.

P. 668. in Rev. 22: 1.

He describes to us, for instance, the hap-
py condition of the Christians from Constan-
tine to the Year 1300, living under the Dis-
cipline of Church-Governours, and a most
pure Church during that interval, and most
worthy of Christ. Thus Monfieur Le Clerc.

Animad.

Here is scarce a word of all this in
Dr. Hammond upon this Chapter. He
do's not mention the Year 1300, &c. All
that he says that can be thought to look
this way is in the first words of Note a.
The five first verses (says he) of this chap-
ter belong to the business of the former chap-
ter, the description of the Christian Church
in its flourishing condition.

P. 668.
If allegorical Divinity were argumentative as the Schoolmen speak, possibly some or other might be deceived by these allegorical Interpretations, and think that Christ approved of all the Excommunications that were denounced by Church-Governours, from the time of Constantine for ten Ages. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

**Animadver**.

Our Monsieur represents Dr. Hammond's Interpretations in his Annotation on this place as having a tendency to persuade men, that Christ approved of all the Excommunications that were denounced by Church-Governours for ten Ages; whereas in the Doctors Annotation there is nothing either of ten Ages, or of Christ's approving the Excommunications denounced by Church-Governours. The Doctor says indeed that the power of excommunicating exercised by Bishops is acknowledged to be the Power of God or Christ, but can any one infer hence that Christ approves of all Excommunications pronounced by Bishops? If so then Christ hath approved of all the Excommunications that have been denounced by
by them (not only for ten Ages, but) from the beginning of Christianity to this day; for the power exercised by Bishops was as much the Power of Christ in other Ages as in the Ten.

Thus I have given Instances, by which the Reader may judge how faithfully our Monsieur hath represented Dr. Hammond's Words and Sense, and should have added more if I had not thought them more than sufficient. It is apparent that it was resolved that Dr. Hammond should be exposed; and if he did not afford matter justly deserving reprehension, that our Monsieur should supply that want out of his own store, and therefore his piece is rightly call'd a Supplement.
Sect. VII.

Of Monsieur Le Clerc's Upbraiding Dr. Hammond with many things, of which he himself is guilty.

I.

He reproves Dr. Hammond for consulting and allegedging Heathen Writers for interpreting some places of the Holy Scripture, and yet he himself doth the same.

P. 488. in 1 Thes. 5. 23.

It is strange that wise Men, in order to know what is in man, i.e. in themselves, should go and consult Plato and Aristotle. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Is it not more strange that any man should go and consult Plato, and the Pythagoreans, and the Stoicks and Poets, in order to know what is meant by ὅ λόγος, S. Joh. 1. 1? How comes our Monsieur to have the privilege that he must be allow'd to allege so many Heathens for the explaining ὅ λόγος, S. Joh. 1, &c. and Dr. Hammond cannot be allow'd to allege an Hea-
Heathen or two for explaining what is meant by *Soul, Body* and *Spirit* as making up the whole Man, 1 Thes. 5.23? And it is very observable concerning his Citations out of the Heathen Writers, that there are only two of them that have the expression ὁ λόγος; all the rest have only λόγος without the Article prefix'd. Our Monsieur's business p. 171, and 172, where we have these Citations, is to prove from them, that ὁ λόγος, S. Job. 1.1. is to be translated *Reason*, not *The Word* as we render it, and p. 172: he alledges Tertullian Apol. c. 21, but that excellent Writer proves to be against him, for he renders λόγος by *Sermo* as well as *Ratio*. His words are these, *Apud vestros quoque sapientes λόγον* i.e. *Sermo et quoque Rationem constat *articulam videre* Universitatis*. Our Monsieur therefore chastises him for it, telling him that there was no need of joyning the word *Sermo* to *Ratio* to render the Greek λόγος, for what place could there be for *Speech* in the creation and disposition of the Universe: Thus our Monsieur, forgetting that in the Creation of the World, God spake the word and it was done, he commanded, and it stood fast.

In the mean time we may see by this what we are to judge of our Monsieur's exposition of those words in *Tertullian adv. Praxeum* cap. 5. *Simplicitatem interpretationis*,
pretationis, i.e. (says our Monsieur p. 156.) imperitiam interpretandi, and so in the Translation p. 157. an unskilfulness in interpreting. Hanc (scil. rationem) Graeci λόγον dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam sermonem appellamus. Ideoque jam in usu est nostro- rum per simplicitatem interpretationis, Ser- monem dicere in primordio apud Deum fuisse. Thus Tertullian: And our Monsieur, who can by no means endure that λόγος should be rendered Sermo, makes the Father to say that it is through unskilfulness in interpreting that some render it so: whereas if he say this, he makes himself an unskilful Interpreter. For we have seen that Tertullian in his Apologetick renders it by Sermo; and not only there, but also in this very Book adv. Praxeam he interprets it so, viz. cap. 7, as when he says Per Ser- monem omnia facta esse & sine illo nihil factum, as S. Joh. 1. 3; and again Sermo erat apud Deum, & Deus erat Sermo, as S. Joh. 1. 1. This is sufficient to shew that Tertullian did not by Simplicitas interpretationis understand unskilfulness in interpreting as our Monsieur to serve his Hypothesis absurdly expounds it. On the contrary Pamelius in his Note plainly tells us that Simplicitas here is taken in bonam partem.

If
II.

If in Dr. Hammond's Annotations there be a mistake in any Quotation by the fault of the Printer, if the words of any Author are not exactly transcribed, or if it chance that we are not directed to the right place in any Author, but another is mention'd instead of it, our Monsieur presently cries out, that the Doctor never look'd into the Author (see p. 84. lin. 1. p. 400. lin. 18, &c.) and yet many such mistakes occur in this very Supplement. I shall only take notice of a few which I have observed in those Citations which we have p. 171, 172, and it will suffice only to name that which we have in the forementioned Citation out of Tertullian, where, by the fault of the Press, we read Constant instead of Constat; but the rest I shall consider more largely.

P. 171.

So Epicharmus the Comedian in his Commonwealth, as he is cited by Clemens Alexand. Strom. 5. "Εύν η τυγκαλε τοι τη ἐκ της της Στρομής της 5." Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

In the Verses which our Monsieur here transcribes out of Clemens Alex. there are more
more mistakes than one. In the first Verse, there is 'Enn instead of Ei, in the second Verse there is biw instead of biw, in the fourth Verse there is Eπιδείκτων αιωνας αυτος αυτος.

P. 171.

Plato in his Timaeus calls the λόγος λογισμὸς reasoning, ἡνὸς ὑπ' ἀψε ἀκος ἀν λογισμὸς Θεό: All this true reasoning of God. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

Here is ἡνὸς ὑπ' instead of ἡνὸς ὑπ', and as our Monsieur is not exact in Transcribing Plato's words, so he hath not been very exact in Translating them, as every one sees; and for my part, I do not see that λόγος is by Plato call'd λογισμὸς.

P. 171.

The Stoicks who, as Diogenes Laertius tells us in Lib. 7. Sect. 135, 136, affirmed, ὁ τε ἐπὶ Θεόν, και νος, και ειμαινείς, και Δία, παλλαίν τε ἐπ' ἀναμοίρασις ἑκομοίμαζον, That it was the same thing which was called God, and the Mind and Fate, and Jupiter, and a great many other names, said also that God
God ηφτ. ἀρχὰς σπερματικὸν ὅπως τῷ κόσμῳ, did in the beginning, being the seminal reason of the World, dispose all things. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

As to the latter Citation, he that consults Diogenes Laertius will find that ηφτ. ἀρχὰς is in the very beginning of one sentence, and σπερματικὸν λόγον ὅπως τῷ κόσμῳ about the middle of the sentence following, and our Monsieur jumbles these together, and withal instead of σπερματικὸν λόγον ὅπως puts σπερματικὸν ὃν λόγος. As to the former Citation, tho' he hath transcrib'd the words exactly, yet I am not satisfied with his Translation of them. That it was the same thing which was called God, and the Mind, and Fate, and Jupiter, and by a great many other names; Thus our Monsieur, but I do not see how ἐν τῷ εἰκώνομαρτῳ can be rendred That it was the same thing which was called; I therefore prefer that rendring of it which we have in Henr. Stephanus's second Edition, Unum quoque Deum esse, ipsumque & mentem, & fatum, & Jovem, multisque aliis appellari nominibus.

P. 172.
Snecse setting down the Opinion of Plato, and the Stoicks, makes frequent mention of Reason, as in Ep. 65. Causa autem, id est Ratio, materiam format & quocunque vult versat—Querimus quid sit causa? Ratio faciens, id est, Deus, &c. And in Lib. de Vita Beata cap. 8. he stiles it incorporialis Ratio ingentium operum artifex. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

These words Incorporialis Ratio, &c. are not in Lib. de Vita Beata cap. 8. As to Epist. 65. it is true that Seneca is setting down the opinion of the Stoicks when he hath the former words; but when he hath those latter words, Querimus quid sit causa, &c. he is not setting down the Opinion of Plato, &c. but he is confuting Plato and his turbas causarum.

We see how many mistakes in citing the Testimonies of Authors are found in two Pages, viz. p. 171, 172. Will our Monsieur now allow us to be as severe upon him, as he is upon Dr. Hammond, and to tell him that he never look'd into the Author's whom he alledges? Perhaps he will throw
throw some of them upon the Printer, and the rest upon the Translator. But, 1. As to the Translator, those which he throws upon him must recoil upon himself; for in the beginning of his Letter to a friend in England, he acquaints us that he had perused several Sheets of an English Version of his Additions to Dr. Hammond, and was well satisfied with the care and faithfulness of the Translator, not doubting of his exactness in other Sheets which he had not then look'd over; but I presume that he perused them also afterward. 2. As to the Printer, if our Monsieur expect that we should be so favourable to him as to believe that these and some other mistakes in his Supplement are by the fault of the Press, he must allow us to be as favourable to Dr. Hammond as to any misquotings that are found in him; and he himself ought to have been as favourable to him. Besides, there are some of these mistakes that cannot be imputed to the Printer.

Our Monsieur's design in heaping up so many Testimonies in these two Pages, is to prove, that οἶκος S. Job. 1, is not to be rendred The Word, but Reason. Jews and Heathens are mustered up in order to the evincing this. But I shall only remark that which he lays of the Jews, who were more ancient than Philo, viz. that they called
called Angels both good and bad λόγος; but
of this he produces only one instance out
of the Book of Wisdom, chap. 18. 15, 16,
where the Author makes the revenging An-
gel that was sent against the Egyptians to
be called λόγος. To which I answer, 1. Ought
not our Monsieur to have tender’d some
proof of this? 2. The Vulgar, Syriack,
Arabick, Junius, &c. do all there render
λόγος the Word. 3. This λόγος is said to be
Almighty ο πανδυναμός of λόγος, but Omni-
potence doth not agree to any Angel, ex-
cept the Angel of the Covenant, the Me-
iah. And we may observe that our Mon-
sieur doth not render it Thine Almighty An-
gel, (that did not sound well) but Thine
Almighty Reason, tho’ it is manifest that
by Reason he understands the revenging
Angel. But let us suppose it to be true that
the Jews called Angels λόγος; what advan-
tage will our Monsieur reap by it? It may
seem rather to make against him, for it
would shew only that λόγος has various sig-
nifications; so that from its signifying thus
or thus in some places, we cannot argue
that it signifies so otherwhere, and so all
his labour in amassing so many Testimonies
is vain. No, says our Monsieur, when they
call Angels λόγος, it is the same as if they
had said Powers endued with Reason, not
with Speech. As if we had not a multi-
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III.

Our Monsieur sometimes finds fault with Dr. Hammond's memory, when his own memory fail'd him at the same time.

P. 581. in S. Fam. 4. 6.

It was a long while since Dr. Hammond had read Virgil, when he alleged his words in such a manner. He describes the Manners of the Romans, and not the part of Kings, Æneid. l. 6. lin. 851. & sequ. Tu regere imperio populos Romane memento, &c. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadw.

Here Dr. Hammond doth not transcribe all the three Verses which our Monsieur doth, and withal he hath these words Regum est, which are not in Virgil. But whether this proceeded from a failure of the Doctor's memory or not, here seems to be a failure both of our Monsieur's memory and of his judgment; of his memory, in not remembering that which goes before those Verses in Virgil; of his judgment, in not rightly understanding them. If he had remembred
membred that which precedes those Verses, he would have perceived that the Poet had been speaking of certain Arts for which some other Nations might be famous; and coming at last to the Romans, he describes the Art in which they should excel, viz. the Art of vanquishing and bearing rule over other Nations, of prescribing the Conditions of Peace, of sparing those that submit themselves, and subduing those that proudly stand out and resist. It is therefore our Monsieur's mistake when he says, that Virgil is describing the Manners of the Romans; he should rather have said their Art, which far surpass'd all those Arts in which other Nations excelled.

P. 664. in Rev. 18. 8.

He ought not to have said, that after the Prophecies of Jeremiah, the Dominion of Babylon was translated to the Medes, but to the Persians as everyone knows: but the confused memory of the four pretended Monarchies put him out. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvs.

Dr. Hammond's memory did not here fail him at all, but our Monsieur's fail'd him most strangely. He had certainly read that
Belsazar, King of Babylon, was told that his kingdom was given to the Medes and Persians, and that Belsazar being slain, Darius the Median took the kingdom, Dan. 5. 28, 30, 31. and in the first year of Darius of the seed of the Medes, Dan. 9. 1, as he had also read of the Laws of the Medes and Persians. He might have read also in the Prophecy of Jeremiah c. 51. 11, that the Lord would raise up the spirit of the Kings of the Medes against Babylon; I omit other places of Scripture. How then could our Monsieur upbraid Dr. Hammond with a confused memory, when he himself had forgotten these known Texts of Sacred Writ, which to plainly testify that the Kingdom of Babylon was translated to the Medes as well as to the Persians?

IV.

Our Monsieur frequently reflects upon Dr. Hammond for borrowing from Grotius and others, when he himself borrows not only from Grotius, but also from Dr. Hammond. It may suffice to give one instance of his making bold with Grotius, and another of his being beholden to the Doctor.
The Jews, who were more ancient than Philo, called Angels λόγος, which Philo also imitated. So the Author of the Book of Wisdom, Ch. 18. 15, 16, speaking of the revenging Angel that was sent against the Egyptians says: Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

All this is out of Grotius upon that place in the Book of Wisdom, whose words are these, Λόγος hic vocat Angelum, ut Philo saepè. Hic est Angelus οἱ ὁλοθρεύων τον ἀρχόντα, Heb. xi. 28. As our Monsieur says that the Jews, who lived before Philo, called Angels λόγος; so Grotius says, that the Jew, who was the Author of the Book of Wisdom (and writ before Philo) calls the Angel of whom he speaks λόγος. And as our Monsieur says that Philo imitated the ancients Jews, so Grotius makes him to have imitated the Author of the Book of Wisdom. Finally, as our Monsieur makes the λόγος here to be the revenging Angel that was sent against the Egyptians, so Grotius says that it is the Angel that destroyed the first-born of the Egyptians. So that nothing can be more manifest, than that...
our Monsieur owed these things to that great and learned Man. But there is one passage in Grotius, which our Monsieur prudently omits. Angels are call'd ἄγγελοι (says Grotius) because they bring with them the Commandments of God, as the Angel here did, v. 16. (Nimirum quod Dei imperia secum ferant, ut jam sequitur) but our Monsieur disliked this, it did not favour his design; and therefore he substitutes another reason of their being so call'd, which I have briefly examined above.

P. 426. in Ephes. 2.10.

The sense of the last words is different from that which is vulgarly thought. They render ἵστασαι ἥπερ by Which he hath prepared, and I do not deny but that according to the Greek construction it may be so rendered; but the thing itself, and the phrase, ought to have admonished Interpreters that it was rather to be understood, and that it should be rendered For which he hath prepared us, or made us fit. Thus Monsieur Le Cleur.

Animadvc.

The words, The sense is different from what is vulgarly thought, and ought to have admonished Interpreters, intimate that;
that our Monsieur was willing that we should believe this to be a new discovery; whereas it is apparent that he is obliged to Dr. Hammond for it. Some render the words ὅς ἐποιήσας Θεὸς Which God hath prepared, but our Monsieur dislikes this, and ἤπατος being understood he would have them translated, For which God hath prepared us: Just so Dr. Hammond before him instead of Which God hath before ordained (as it is in our Translation) hath in his Margin To which God hath before prepared us; and accordingly in his Paraphrase he interprets it He hath accommodated us, &c. It is therefore most manifest that Dr. Hammond thought that ἤπατος is to be understood, and that our Monsieur learnt this from him, tho' he pretends that the thing it self and the phrase ought to have taught it Interpreters.

Not that I think that our Monsieur is to be blamed for learning and borrowing from so good Authors as Grotius and Dr. Hammond; that which I reprehend him for is, that he so frequently reflects upon others for doing that which he doth him- self.
Of Dr. Hammond's borrowing from Grotius and others.

That Dr. Hammond hath borrowed sometimes from Grotius and others will be granted, and yet I believe that upon Examination it will be found that our Monsieur injures him as to this, making him to have borrowed from them when he doth nor. I shall give a few instances of this.


What our Author hath here is borrowed from Grotius, who says the same in his Notes on Matt. 27. 45. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadversions upon

When our Monsieur says, What our Author has here is borrowed from Grotius, if his meaning be that what Dr. Hammond hath here is all of it borrowed from that learned Person, it is certainly false. That which the Doctor says, 1. Of the Greek and Latin Manuscript; 2. Of the Alexandrian; 3. Of the whole νυξ ἔξηκεν being divided
Monsieur Le Clerc's Reflections. divided into eight parts; 4. Of Petrus Bishop of Alexandria is not found in Grotius. It is true that Dr. Hammond's way of reconciling the Evangelists S. Mark and S. John is the same with Grotius's; but whether he learned it from Grotius or any other I cannot pretend to know, neither know I what advantages our Monsieur had for knowing more than I as to this matter.

P 278. in Rom. 8. 26.

The rest our Author had from Grotius, and nothing is his own but his translating the Greek word πόνος by labour. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

The rest comprehends all this. That ἡμέρα is oft used concerning Sin the disease of the Soul, and that ἡμέρα here signifies all the sad particulars mention'd v. 35, and which if the Context be observed will appear to belong to this place, and will be agreeable to the notion of ἡμέρα, which signifying νόσος, in labour, sorrow, is frequently used for disease, distress, and rendered by the word here used ἡμέρα weaknesses; so is the word used 1 Cor. 2. 3. referring to the persecutions and dangers that Paul at Corinth had met with.
Animadversions upon
with in his preaching: Thus Dr. Hammond.
Now all that Grotius has to this purpose is that ἀνάθεμα signifies dolores ex rebus adversis, and that ἀναθημα is rendred πόνος, ἀνομία ἀνάθεμα. Let any one now judge whether Dr. Hammond had all that which I have here transcribed from Grotius, as our Monsieur says he had.

P. 606. in 2 Pet. 2. 13.

Seeing our Author had begun to borrow of Grotius what he here says, he ought with him to have added that it was read so by the Vulgar Latin Interpreter. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

It seems very plain to me that Dr. Hammond did not borrow from Grotius that which he says in his Annotation upon the place. If there was nothing else, this alone which our Monsieur mentions, that he do's not take notice that the Vulgar Latin Interpreter read ἀνάθεμα (not ἀναθημα) satisfies me, that he did not as much as look into Grotius upon the place; for it being his business to make it probable that ἀνάθεμα is the truer Reading, he would not have omitted this, if he had taken notice of it.
Monsieur Le Clerc's Reflections. 301

Also if he had look'd into Grotius, he would not have writ ἀγάπας ἀνωτός, for Grotius is of opinion that if we read ἀγάπας, ἀνωτός is to be omitted. I therefore incline to think, that Dr. Hammond finding ἀγάπας in S. Jude v. 12. judg'd his authority sufficient, and look'd no further. And this is the only reason that I can give, why he did not consult the Alexandrian Manuscript, which here (viz. 2 Pet. 2. 13.) hath ἀγάπας instead of ἀγάπας.

P. 143. in S. Luk. 16. 19.

This Translation which the Doctor gives us of the Parable set down in the Gemara Babyl. is partly according to the words in the Hebrew, and partly according to the Latin Version of R. Sheringamus, and taken from thence. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvv.

Here I must tell our Monsieur that he mistakes very much, when he says that part of Dr. Hammond's Translation of the Parable is according to the Latin Version of Mr. Sheringham, and taken from thence. This he might have prevented by looking further into Mr. Sheringham's Preface to his joma, where he acknowledges that the
the Translation was not his, but he had transcrib'd both it and the Hebrew from Cunradus Otto in his Gali Rezia. But our Monsieur hath obliged us to forgive him this mistake; because he (being here in a better mood than he usually is) is for forgiving others their mistakes; yea he warns the Reader, that he ought not to be too severe a judge of those mistakes which the Learned sometimes fall into through want of care, since we err sometimes when we are most careful. Is it not strange that he who could give such excellent advice, should set himself to practise the contrary, so that a severer Judge of the (supposed, not real) mistakes of others perhaps never appeared in the world? But to return to Dr. Hammond, it may be said that tho' our Monsieur be mistaken in saying that his Translation is partly according to the Latin Version of Mr. Sheringham (because that Version is not Mr. Sheringham's, but Cunr. Otto's) yet it is true still, that part of his Translation is taken from that Version. In answer to which, I grant that some small part of his Translation is according to Otto's Version, but say, that it doth not follow thence that it is taken from it. It is scarcely possible that two persons should translate the same sentence, and not agree in some thing. He that compares the two Versions will be satisfied,
Monsieur Le Clerc's Reflections. 303

...tished, that the Doctor perceiving that Oett had used too much freedom in translating, resolved to translate it anew from the Original.

P. 259. in Rom. 3. 2.

The Doctor took what he here says out of Rob. Sheringamius in his Notes on cap. 8. Joma. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadvt.

I grant that some things which Dr. Hammond says are found in Mr. Sheringham upon Joma cap. 7. (not cap. 8.) but do's it follow that he took them out of him? However it will not follow that he took all that he says out of him, tho' our Monsieur would persuade us that he did, for he says indefinitely The Doctor took what he here says, &c. Dr. Hammond here differs in some things from Mr. Sheringham. Mr. Sheringham renders the Greek word λόγον by Rationale, Dr. Hammond supposes that it rather signifies Oratine, because the Word or Oracle of God was revealed by it. Mr. Sheringham seems to think that beside the prominence of the Letters a voice was heard, or however the Holy Spirit did affect or direct the High-Priest in putting the Letters together, so as
Animadversions upon
as to make out the Answer, and he is dis-
pleased with Schikard for saying that it is
certain that no voice was heard. On the
other hand Dr. Hammond endeavours to
shew that there was no necessity of a voice,
and that the Letters which were prominent,
or which shined in the Pectoral, made the
Response. Will our Monsieur say that
these things which the Doctor says in op-
position to Mr. Sheringham, were borrow'd
from him?

S E C T. IX.

Of Monsieur Le Clerc's confident assent-
ing things, and of his Nonsense.

I

Shall only give a single instance of ei-
ther of these, and so conclude these
Animadversions.

P. 58. in S. Matth. 17. 25.

There is not any mention made of Syria
in Cicero's Orations against Verres. Thus
Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadv.

We can scarce cast our eye upon any part
of our Monsieur's Supplement, in which
we
we shall not find instances of his unparallel'd confidence in asserting things, but this seemed to me to have something peculiar in it. 

1. It is known that Cicero hath several Orations against Verres, and for him to have the confidence to aver, that in all these there is not any mention of Syria, seems to be more than ordinary.

2. A little prudence would have taught him more caution, and not to have been so positive in asserting it when there was no necessity of his saying any thing at all of it. 

3. All the ground of his assurance was, that consulting Nizolius, &c. he found that they had not observed that Syria is mentioned in the Orations against Verres.

4. If instead of them he had consulted Cicero himself, he might have discovered the falsity of his assertion; for in the last Oration in Verrem but one, the word Syria occurs at the least five times, whilst he is speaking of Antiochus one of the Kings of Syria. Reges Syriae, and again, Non propter Syriae regnum, and after that, In Syriae profecti sunt, after this, Ut mos est regius & maxime in Syria, and lastly, Dignam regno Syriae. This one instance of our Monsieur’s most vain and groundless confidence may suffice, without mentioning the rest, which his Supplement in every page of it would very liberally have afforded us.
P. 233. in Act. 17. 19.

And Pallas is feigned to have been the Goddess of War in the same manner as Mars. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animad. v.

Our Monsieur may do well to inform us in what manner Mars was the Goddess of War. He had said a little before that he was made the God of War, which every one knows; but none before our Monsieur ever made him the Goddess of it too. This then may serve for an instance of his Non-sense. But some may say that however I ought not to have taken notice of so small a matter as this. To which I answer, that I should not have taken notice of it, if our Monsieur had not reflected upon so many things in Dr. Hammond, in which, if he did err, the error is very venial and inconsiderable. It will not be amiss to allude a few instances of this.

P. 24. in S. Matth. 6. 11.

Our Author makes it to relate also to the Mind or Soul; but without any necessity, for those things which concern the Soul are contained in the foregoing Verses. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Animad

Dr. Hammond teaches us by 'Daily bread to understand the necessaries of our Bodies; especially of our Souls.' Our Monsieur will not allow this, tho' he himself must confess that, if it be an error, it is a very pardonable one. The reason why he doth not allow of it is, because the things which concern the Soul are contain'd in the foregoing Verses. As if the Petitions contain'd in the preceding Verses had no respect at all to the Body. Are we not to hallow and glorify God both with our Bodies, and with our Spirits, and to pray that we may do it? Are we not to pray that not Sin but Grace may reign in our mortal Bodies, as also that we may do the Will of God, and so serve and please him in Soul and Body both? Why then may we not with Dr. Hammond understand the necessaries for both to be signified in this Expression 'Daily bread'?

P. 24. in S. Matth. 6. 11.

In Prov. 30. 8. ἐπιλακόν does not properly signify food convenient for me, but my allowance or proportion of it. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.
Our Translators studying to express the sense of the word יִהְיֶה as plainly as they could, did not strictly retain the usual significance of the word יִהְיֶה, but rendered it Convenient for me, and Dr. Hammond follows them. If this be a fault, it is a very innocent and pardonable one, and yet this cannot escape our Monsieur's censure. If he had observed that other Interpreters use the like freedom here as our Translators do, he would perhaps have overlooked'd it. Thus the LXX render it, Things necessary and sufficient, the Vulgar Vulgo necessaria, the Arubick, That which I stand in need of, the Chaldee, The bread of my sufficiency or sufficient for me, and so the Syriack hath Of my sufficiency, the word being the same with that in the Chaldee Paraphra'st. I may add that our Monsieur himself hath not rendered it exactly, for he should have said, The food of my allowance or proportion, and not (as he doth) My allowance or proportion of it, i.e. of food.

P. 129. in S. Luk. 3. 1.

Our Author seems in another place, by an intolerable impropriety of Speech, to give Herod
Monsieur Le Clerc's Reflections.

Herod the Title of a Roman Governor. Thus Monsieur Le Clerc.

Animadu.

Our Monsieur falls upon Dr. Hammond twice for this, viz. P. 76 in S. Matth. 22. 16, and here. He that depended wholly upon the Roman Emperours for his Government, cannot be allow’d to have the Title of Roman Governor. The Emperour Augustus made this Herod (viz. Herod Antipas.) Tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, (Josephus Antiq. 1. 17. c. 13.) he and his Successors might have taken this Government from him whenever they pleased, and at last Caligula did actually deprive him of it; and yet Dr. Hammond is guilty of an intolerable impropriety of Speech for giving him the forefaid Title. But let us hear his Reasons why he is so much displeased at it. 1. Who (sais he p. 76.) would not think that in it be affirmd Herod to be a Roman, sent by Tiberius to govern Judæa? As if none could properly be call’d a Roman Governour, but he that was originally a Roman, and sent to govern Judæa by Tiberius. 2. He says here p. 129, that it is as if he (i.e. Herod) had not ruled his Principality in his own name, but in the Emperour's; but this I deny. He that depended
pended, wholly upon the Roman Empe-
rou for his Government (as Herod did)
may properly be stiled a Roman Gover-
nour, whether he ruled his Principality in
his own name or not. Dr. Hammond up-
on this very place S. Luke 3. 1. Note b in
a few words expresses this matter so clear-
ly, as that it might have prevented all our
Monsieur's Cavils. He says that Herod
was placed by the Romans over the Region
of Galilee with Regal power. Being pla-
ced over Galilee by the Romans, he is right-
ly call'd a Roman Governour; and yet ha-
vying Regal power, ruling as King (S. Matth.
14. 9.) he differ'd from Pilate, who was
only a Deputy or Procurator, and govern'd
in the name of the Emperour only, not in
his own.

These Anintadversions may suffice, for
I did not design a full Vindication of Dr.
Hammond, leaving that to those whose years
and abilities may encourage them to under-
take so necessary and excellent a Work. It
is enough that I have discover'd our Mon-
sieur's unworthiness in reflecting so strange-
ly upon our Saviour, his Apostles with oth-
er divinely inspired persons, and the Pri-
native Fathers, as well as in his so frequent
misrepresenting Dr. Hammond's words and
sense; as also his boldness in asserting, his
no less intolerable presumption in cenfu-
ring; his unskilfulness in the Hebrew and other Eastern Languages, as well as in Matters of Chronology, &c. In short, I hope that the Reader will be satisfied after all our Monsieur's insulting over good Dr. Hammond, that these Animadversions have really discover'd as many mistakes in his Quarto, as he pretends to have found in the Doctor's large Folia; and he that shall undertake the Doctor's Vindication, may easily find more than double the number.

Our Monsieur may possibly think to help the matter by imputing some of the mistakes to the Translator. But to this I say, perhaps he himself was the Translator. However he tells us in his Letter prefix'd to the Translation, that several Sheets of it were sent over to him before it was made publick, and that he perus'd them; and we cannot question but that the rest were transmitted to him as they were finished, and by that expression Which I have not yet look'd over, he may seem to have expected it. It appears moreover that the Translation was publish'd with his Allowance, Approbation, and Recommendation. His words in the foresaid Letter are, Having perus'd several Sheets which were sent me over, I was well satisfied with the care and faithfulness of the Translator, not doubting of his exactness in the other Sheets, which
which I have not yet look'd over. Much more could not have been said in Commendation of the Translation. Add hereto, that he hath had time enough since the Publishing it, to give the World notice of the Translator's mistakes (if there were any his) which he hath not done: By all which he hath made them his own, and rob'd himself of this subterfuge by throwing the mistakes upon the Translator.
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A Premonition to the Reader.

In his Preface to his Reasonableness of Christianity, Mr. Locke tells us, That the little Satisfaction and Constistency that is to be found in most of the Systems of Divinity that he had met with, made him betake himself to the sole reading of the Scripture; and what he receiv'd from thence he deliver'd to his Reader in that Treatise. And as the little Satisfaction and Constistency which he found in some Systems of Divinity, was the Occasion of his Writing and Publishing that Discourse; so, the little Satisfaction and Constistency which I found in his System, (viz. his Reasonableness of Christianity foremention'd) was one Occasion of my drawing up the following Account and the Observations upon it.

When Mr. Locke says, The little Satisfaction and Constistency to be found in most of the Systems of Divinity that he had met with; these Words Most of the Systems imply, that he had met with some Systems in which more Satisfaction and Constistency may be found; and he would have oblig'd the World, if he had pleas'd to acquaint us what Systems those are.

In giving an Account of his Religion, that neither he might have Cause to complain, nor the Reader to suspect that I have misrepresented him; I judg'd it necessary to do it out of his own Writings, and in his own Words. I thought this would be the most effectual course to satisfy both him and others, that I had no Design to represent him to his Disadvantage.

It was also necessary to set down that which Mr. Locke hath deliver'd agreeably to the Form of sound Words, and to the Doctrine which is according to Godliness, as well as that in which he departs from the Truth, and from the Words of wholesome Doctrine; for otherwise the Account would have been imperfect; and withal, if I had omitted that which is good and justifiable, and presented the Reader only with that which is to be disliked and disapprov'd in his Religion, I should have incurred the Guilt of disobeying the Charge given 1 Tim. 5. 21. to do nothing by Partiality, or inclining to one part more than the
the other. I am so far from envying Mr. Lock the Honour of having said some things well, that I heartily wish he had said all so; and that there had been nothing reprehensible, or deserving Censure, in his Religion. Besides, there may be those who will more willingly learn some Truths from Mr. Lock than from others, embracing them more readily upon the account of his Approbation or Recommendation; and for the sake of these I thought it not amiss to transcribe that which was consonant to Truth as well as that which I found dissolvent from it. By this means also the Reader may better perceive the little Consistency that there is in Mr. Lock's Writings, how he destroys that which he had built up, affords the Truth in one place, and seeks to obtrude on us the contrary Error in another.

The Account is divided into Chapters, and in every Chapter I first set down what Mr. Lock says upon those Heads that are mentioned in the Contents of it, and then subjoin some brief Observations upon it. And that the Reader may more readily find any Passage transcribed out of Mr. Lock, I have directed him to the Book, Chapter, and Section of his Essay, and to the Page in his other Treatises; as I have also signified what Editions of them I have made use of.

I am very sensible, how little Encouragement there is from without, for any Man to appear in the Maintenance of those weighty Truths which are treated of in the following Account and the Observations upon it. The Consideration of which may perhaps incline the Reader more firmly to believe, that it is only a desire to be useful and serviceable while he is in the World, and a real Concern for the Truth and for Religion, that put the Author upon this Work, upon which Account he hopes that his sincere, though weak, Endeavours will be more favourably accepted. The Result of those Endeavours he here presents to publick View, humbly commending it to the Blessing of Heaven; and if by it he hath done any acceptable Service to God and his Church, he hath his Desire; and may that Holy and Blessed Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, have the Glory.
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CHAP. I.

OF GOD.

To come to the being certain that there is a God, I think we need go no farther than our selves, and that undoubted Knowledge we have of our own Being. I think it is beyond question, That Man has a clear Perception of his own Being; he knows certainly that he exists, and that he is Something. In the next place, Man knows, by an intuitive Certainty, that bare Notting cannot produce any real Being. If therefore we know there is some real Being, and that Non-entity cannot produce any real Being, it is an evident Demonstration, that from Eternity there has been Something; since what was not from Eternity had a Beginning, and what had a Beginning must be produc'd by something else. Next it is evident, That what had its Being and Beginning from another, must also have all that which is in, and belongs to its Being, from another too: All the Powers it has must be owing to, and received from the same Source. This eternal
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Source then of all Being, must also be the Source and Original of all Power; and so this eternal Being must be also the most powerful. Again, a Man finds in himself Perception and Knowledge. We have then got one step farther; and we are certain now, that there is some knowing intelligent Being in the World. There was a time then, when there was no knowing Being, and when Knowledge began to be; or else there has been also a knowing Being from Eternity. If it be said, There was a time when no Being had any Knowledge, when that eternal Being was void of all Understanding; I reply, That then it was impossible there should ever have been any Knowledge: it being impossible that things wholly void of Knowledge, and operating blindly, and without any Perception, should produce a knowing Being. Thus, from the Consideration of our selves, and what we infallibly find in our own Constitutions, our Reason leads us to the knowledge of this certain and evident Truth, that There is an eternal, most powerful, and most knowing Being; which whether any one will please to call God, it matters not; the thing is evident. Mr. Locke, Essay l. 4. c. 10. §. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. There is no Truth which a Man may more evidently make out to himself, than the Existence of a God, Essay, l. 1. c. 4. §. 22. We have a more certain Knowledge of the Existence of a God, than of any thing our Senses have not immediately discover'd to us. Nay, I presume I may say, that we more certainly know that there is a God, than that there is any thing else without us. The being of a God is so fundamental a Truth, and of that consequence, that all Religion and genuine Morality depend thereon. Essay, l. 4. c. 10. §. 6, 7. Thus Mr. Locke.

OBSERVATIONS.

Though the Essay says so much of our certain Knowledge of the Existence of a God; yet it also tells
tells us, that he hath given us no innate Ideas of himself; he has stamp'd no original Characters on our Minds, wherein we may read his Being. So l. 4. c. 10. § 1. It also informs us, that Navigation hath discover'd whole Nations, amongst whom there was to be found no Notion of a God; adding, that perhaps if we should with attention mind the Lives and Discourses of People not so far off, we should have too much reason to fear, that many in more civiliz'd Countries have no very strong and clear Impressions of a Deity upon their Minds. See l. 1. c. 4. § 8. Now as to the second of these, The Discovery of whole Nations, amongst whom there was to be found no Notion of a God; some think that Mr. Lock had done better if he had not urg'd it: for they judge that it tends to the invalidating the Argument which is made use of, not only by Christians, but also (as they tell us) by the wisest and greatest Men among the Heathens, to prove the Existence of a Deity. The Argument is drawn from the universal Consent of Mankind, as to the Being of a God. What says Mr. Lock to this? He denies that he doth invalidate it, and it concern'd him to deny it; for he who had said in his first Letter, that no Arguments that are made use of to work the Persuasion of a God into Mens minds, should be invalidated, granting it to be of ill consequence; should be very careful that he do not invalidate any such Arguments. But I ask, Doth not Mr. Lock invalidate the Argument from the universal Consent of Mankind, who says expressly, that besides the Atheists, taken notice of amongst the Ancients, and left branded upon the Records of History, Navigation hath discover'd whole Nations, amongst whom there was to be found no Notion of a God? Can there be an universal Consent, when besides particular Persons, there are whole Nations that do not consent? Yea, so far they are from consenting, that they have not so much as any Notion of a God.
Yet notwithstanding all this, Mr. Locke asserts, that he hath not said one word that does in the least invalidate the Argument for a God, or does at all tend to the invalidating it. For (says he) I think that the universal Consent of Mankind, as to the being of a God, amounts to this much, That the vastly greater Majority of Mankind have in all Ages of the World actually believ'd a God; that a Majority of the remaining part have not actually disbeliev'd it; and consequently, those who have actually oppos'd the Belief of a God, have truly been very few. See his Third Letter, p. 447, 448. Where some perhaps would ask, 1. What Mr. Locke means by the vastly greater Majority of Mankind? If he had said, A very great Majority of Mankind, he might have been understood; but, The vastly greater Majority of Mankind, implies that we may divide Mankind into two Majorities, the one of which is vastly greater than the other. 2. They may perhaps also ask, Whether all that do not actually oppose the Being of a God, or not actually disbelieve it, do consent to it? If they all do not, then though they that actually oppose be truly very few, yet they that consent not to it may be many: and though it should be granted to be true, that the majority of those that believe not that there is a God, do not yet actually disbelieve it, it will not follow that the Majority of them do consent to it: for I am prone to think, that none do truly and inwardly consent to it, who do not believe it. And therefore that which Mr. Locke says of not disbelieving, and the fewness of those that oppose, doth not help the matter at all. 3. The Question then is, Whether (to use his own Words) in respect of the incomparably greater Majority of those who have own'd the Belief of a God, it may be said to be the universal Consent of Mankind? Or, Whether that can be said to have the universal Consent of Mankind, to which, besides particular Persons, whole Nations do not consent.
fent. Now I think there are very few that will not answer it in the Negative. I cannot imagine that they who have urg'd the universal Consent of Mankind as an Argument, did believe that, besides particular Persons, whole Nations did not consent. And therefore if this which Mr. Lock urgeth be true, the Argument from universal Consent seems to be totally invalidated. Wherefore it will be necessary to examine how he hath acquitted himself in the proof of it; viz. That there have been not only particular Persons Atheists, but also whole Nations who had no Notion of a God. 1. He mentions the Atheists taken notice of amongst the Ancients, and left branded upon the Records of History; but this only in general: if he had descened to Particulars, perhaps it would have been found, that at least some of them were branded with Atheism, because they did not favour the Heathen Polytheism; or, because they thought those that were accounted Gods, not to be Gods: which was the Accusation against Socrates. See Diog. Laert. in vit. Socrat. And 'tis very observable, that Cicero, De Natura Deorum, 1. 1. names only two that thought there were no Gods; viz. Diagoras Melinus and Theodorus Cyrenaicus: and Clemens Alexandrinus defends them, saying, that they were Men of a sober Life; and expressing his Admiration how it came that they call'd them Atheists. See him in Admonit. ad Gentes, p. 11. 2. He brings Testimonies to prove, that Navigation hath discover'd whole Nations, amongst whom there was to be found no Notion of a God; so far were they from consenting to the exisiting of a Deity. He allleges the Relations of several Writers, but he should have been so kind, as to have transcrib'd their Words for us, (for I find that they are not to be met with every where,) whereas he hath only given us the Words of two of them, or three at the most. The Words which he sets down out of Nicolau de Techo's Relatio triplex de
de rebus Indicis Caaiguarum, are these; Reperi eam
gentem nullum nomen habere quod Deum & hominis
animam significet, nulla Sacra habet, nulla Idola. See
the Essay, l. i. c. 4. §. 8. Out of Mr. Ovington's Re-
lation of his Voyage to Surat, he gives us these
Words, They are sunk even below Idolatry, are de-
stitute of both Priest and Temple, and saving a little
shew of rejoicing, which is made at the Full and New
Moon, have left all kind of Religious Devotion. Na-
ture hath so richly provided for their Convenience in
this Life, that they have drown'd all Sense of the
God of it, and are grown quite careless of the next.
He adds, That Coore, an Inhabitant of the Country,
who could speak English, affir'd Mr. Terry, that they
of Soldania had no God: See the Third Letter,
p. 450. Now as to these Testimonies, 1. It must be
remembred that Mr. Lock would prove from them,
that there are whole Nations amongst whom there is
found no Notion of a God: whereas it is not said
in any of these Testimonies, that the Nations spo-
ken of had no Notion of a God. Nicolaus de Teco
tells of a People that have no Idols or Images, no
Sacred Offices or Services, no Name for God: but
he doth not say, that they had no Notion of him.
He says likewise, That they had not a Name for
Man's Soul; but it doth not follow thence, that they
had no Notion of something within them that did
Think, Understand, Will, Reason, &c. Coore says,
That they of Soldania had no God; i.e. They had
no particular God (as other Heathens might have)
which their whole Nation worshipp'd: but it can-
not be inferr'd hence, that they had no Notion of a
God. Mr. Ovington says, That they are sunk even
below Idolatry; but he doth not say, That they are
sunk so low, as that they have not so much as any
Notion of a Deity. 2. Yea, Mr. Ovington's Testi-
mony is clearly against Mr. Lock; for, when he says,
Saving a little shew of rejoicing which is made at the
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Full and New Moon, they have lost all kind of Religious Devotion; it is manifest that, according to him, they express'd some Religious Devotion every Full and New Moon. And when he says, that they have drown'd all Sense of the God of it; doth not this necessarily imply that they had a Sense of him before they drown'd it? Not to add, That too many among us seem to have drown'd all Sense of a God, and are grown quite careless of a future Life; though they profess the Belief of a God, and of the Life of the World to come. Besides these three, Mr. Lock names Sir Tho. Rhoë apud Thevenot, p. 2. and Jo. de Lery, c. 16. Sir Tho. Rhoë apud Thevenot, I have not met with. Of Joannes Lerius his Historia Navigationis in Brasliam, c. 16. I can give some account. It is true that he says of his Tououpinambaultii, that they are ignorant of the true God; and also, that they acknowledge no false Gods, whether Celestial or Terrestrial. But afterwards he proposes the Question, Whether these Americans liv'd without any Religion? Where though he first answers, that they want but a very little of it; yet he adds, that they believe the Immortality of the Soul, and that the Souls of the Vertuous shall live in perpetual Pleasure and Delights, but the Souls of the rest in everlasting Torments after this Life. He tells also, that they had their Priests, and their Assemblies once in three Years, in which they believ'd that a Spirit talk'd with them. He takes notice also of their Trembling at the hearing of Thunder, which (says he) argues a dread of some Power. And finally, he makes frequent mention of a Cacodemon which they said was seen by them, sometime in one shape, sometime in another, and did most miserably vex them. From all this he concludes, that Religion was not quite extinguish'd, but some sparks of it remain'd among them. Thus I have examin'd all Mr. Lock's Testimonials, (except Sir Tho. Rhoë's, which I could not meet
meet with;) and now the Reader may judge how firmly he hath prov'd. That amongst some whole Nations there is found no Notion of a God. And if it appear that he hath not firmly prov'd it, then not only the Argument for the Existence of a God, drawn from the universal Consent of Mankind, is left in full force, and that holds true which Tully faith, de Legibus, l. 1. Nulla gens est, neque tam immanfua-ta, neque tam fera, que non etiamis ignoret qualem habere Deum debeat, tamen babendum sciat; but also Mr. Lock's principal Argument to prove his darling Notion, that we have no innate Ideas of a God, falls to the ground. His principal Argument that he urgeth for proof of that Notion, is this which I have insisted upon, that whole Nations are found to have no Notion of a God: And we see how far he is from evincing this.

As to the Argument which follows in the same place, (viz. Essay, l. 1. c. 4. §. 8.) whereby he would prove that beloved Notion, that we have no innate Ideas of a God, drawn from the Atheism which is among us, which (says he) some profligate Wretches do barefacedly own, and others would, if the fear of the Magistrate's Sword, or their Neighbour's Censure, did not tie up Peoples Tongues, it signifies nothing; unless Mr. Lock could assure us (which he cannot) that their Atheistical Discourse is the Language of their Hearts, as it is too plainly the Language of their Lips and Lives. For any thing that he knows, their Hearts may give their Tongues the Lye, and there may be inward Fears and Whispers that there is a God, at the same time that they most stoutly deny it: or if not at the same time, yet afterward Sicknefs, or the Approach of Death, may awake the Sense of a Deity, which they hop'd they had laid asleep, never to awake; and make the Notions and Characters which they had labour'd to obliterate, as legible as ever.
Mr. Lock's Religion, &c.

Before I leave this, I cannot but observe, that, though in his Essay, l. 4. c. 10. §. 7. Mr. Lock would not examine how far the Idea of a most Perfect Being does or does not prove the Existence of a God, yet in his First Letter, p. 119. he clearly determines it in the Negative, saying, That the Complex Idea, for which the sound [GOD] stands, will not prove the real Existence of a Being answering that Idea, as p. 121. he tells us, that he thought it would not prove it when he writ his Essay. I take notice of this, because hereby he invalidates another Argument for proving the Existence of a Deity, when but a little before, viz. p. 114. he had affirm'd it to be of ill Consequence to invalidate any Arguments that are made use of to work the Persuasion of a God into Mens Minds, and when otherwhere, viz. Essay, l. 4. c. 10. §. 7. he blames others for endeavouring to invalidate such Arguments. Why then doth he that himself, which he condemns in others? He tells us, in his First Letter, p. 115. That when he writ his Essay, he was unwilling to shew the Weakness of the Argument from the Idea of God; but when he writ that Letter, he had taken Courage, and pronounceth roundly, that the Idea mentioned will not prove the Existence of a God.

But to conclude, how blame-worthy soever Mr. Lock may be for weakening these two Arguments made use of to prove the Existence of a Deity, the one from the universal Consent of Mankind, as to the Being of a God, the other from the Idea that we have of him; yet we should not judge charitably, if we concluded thence, that he doth not believe a God.
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CHAP. II.

Of the Attributes of God.

Do not pretend to say how the Attributes are in God, who is infinitely beyond the Reach of our narrow Capacities. They do, without doubt, contain in them all possible Perfection. Mr. Locke, Essay, l. 2. c. 17. §. 1.

His Wisdom, Power, and Goodness.

His Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, are inexhaustible, incomprehensible, &c. Essay, l. 2. c. 17. §. 1. I judge it as certain and as clear a Truth as any can any where be deliver’d, That the invisible things of God, from the Creation of the World, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead, Essay, l. 4. c. 10. §. 7. He has in his Hand Rewards and Punishments, and Power enough to call to Account the proudest Offender, Essay, l. 1. c. 3. §. 6. What God can do, must not be limited to what we can conceive of it: This would be to make our Comprehension infinite, or God finite. If you do not understand the Operations of your own finite Mind, do not deem it strange that you cannot comprehend the Operations of that eternal, infinite Mind, who made and governs all things, Essay, l. 4. c. 10. §. 19. God is truly above all passive Power, Essay, l. 2. c. 21. §. 2. He knows our Fraility, pities our Weakness, and requires of us no more than we are able to do; and sees what is, and what is not in our Power, and so will judge as a kind and merciful Father, Essay, l. 2. c. 21. §. 53.

His Knowledge, Happiness, and Veracity.

The Eternal Being must also be Knowing, and all other Knowing Beings must depend on him, and have
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no other Ways of Knowledge, or Extent of Power, than what he gives them: And if he made those, he made also the least excellent Pieces of this Universe, all inanimate Beings, whereby his Omniscience, Power, and Providence, will be established, and all his other Attributes necessarily follow, Essay, l. 4. c. 10. §. 12.


§. 6. Perception and Knowledge in that One Eternal Being, where it has its Source, 'tis visible must be essentially inseparable from it, the Third Letter, p. 410. God Almighty is under the Necessity of being Happy, Essay, l. 2. c. 21. §. 50. The Veracity of God is a Demonstration of the Truth of what he hath revealed, the Third Letter, p. 420. An infinitely Powerful and Wise Being cannot but be Veracious.

Besides, I speak in more Places than one of the Goodness of God, another Evidence, as I take it, of his Veracity, Answ. to Remarks, p. 3. He cannot deceive, nor be deceived, the Third Letter, p. 147.

His Immateriality, Eternity, and Ubiquity.

'Tis past all doubt, that every one that examines and reasons right, may come to a Certainty, that God is perfectly Immaterial, the Third Letter, p. 147. The Idea of an Eternal, Actual, Knowing Being, hath a Connexion with the Idea of Immateriality, the First Letter, p. 139. God fills Eternity, and 'tis hard to find a Reason why any one should doubt that he likewise fills Immensity. His Infinite Being is certainly as boundless one way as another, Essay, l. 2. c. 15. §. 3. We can conceive the Eternal Duration of the Almighty far different from that of Man, or any other Finite Being. His Duration being accompanied with Infinite Knowledge, and Infinite Power, he sees all things past and to come, and they are no more distant from his Knowledge, no farther removed from his Sight, than the present. They all lie under the same View: And there is nothing which
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he cannot make exist each moment he pleases, Essay, l. 2. c. 15. §. 12. We apply our Idea of Infinite to the First and Supreme Being, primarily in respect of his Duration and Ubiquity, Essay, l. 2. c. 17. §. 1. Motion cannot be attributed to God, not because he is a Spirit, but because he is an Infinite Spirit, Essay, l. 2. c. 23. §. 21.

His Infinity, and other Perfections.

The great God, of whom and from whom are all things, is incomprehensibly Infinite; but yet, when we apply to that First and Supreme Being our Idea of Infinite, in our weak and narrow Thoughts, we do it primarily in respect of his Duration and Ubiquity; and, I think, more figuratively to his Power, Wisdom, Goodness, and other Attributes, which are properly inexhaustible and incomprehensible, &c. For when we call them Infinite, we have no other Idea of this Infinity, but what carries with it some Reflection on and Intimation of that Number, or Extent of the Acts and Objects of God's Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, which can never be supposed so great or so many, which these Attributes will not surmount and exceed, let us multiply them in our Thoughts with all the Infinity of endless Number; Essay, l. 2. c. 17. §. 1. Whatsoever is first of all things, must necessarily contain in it, and actually have at least all the Perfections that can ever after exist, Essay, l. 4. c. 10. §. 10. Thus Mr. Lock.

Observations.

When Mr. Lock says, that God is truly above all passive Power, I shall not trouble myself to enquire whether the Expression, Passive Power, be proper or no: His Meaning is, that he can receive no Change. That is most true which he saith of the Eternal Duration of God, That we can conceive it far diffe-
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rent from that of Man, or any other Finite Being, for his Duration hath not either Beginning or End of Days, which agrees to no Finite Being, neither to Man nor Angel. But as to the Difference which Mr. Lock assigns, it is manifest, that it is not in the Duration itself, but in the Knowledge and Power which accompany it: God sees all things past, present, and to come, they all lie under the same View; and he can make any thing exist each moment that he pleases: But this cannot be said of any Finite Being whatsoever. So that Mr. Lock shews that there is a great Difference between the Knowledge and Power of God, and ours; but as to the Eternal Duration of God, of which he was here speaking, that is a distinct Attribute.

When he faith, That when we apply to God our Idea of Infinity in our weak and narrow Thoughts, we do it primarily in respect of his Duration and Ubiquity, and, I think, more figuratively to his Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, and other Attributes, which are properly inexhaustible and incomprehensible, &c. It may be enquir'd what he means by more figuratively: Is it his Meaning, that we apply it to him less figuratively, in respect of his Duration and Ubiquity? If so, we apply it to him figuratively, even in respect of them; and consequently we do not apply Infinity to God properly in any respect; which Conclusion surely Mr. Lock will not own. Besides, if it be true which Mr. Lock says, that the Power, Wisdom, Goodness, and other Attributes of God, are properly Inexhaustible and Incomprehensible, why is it not as true that they are properly Boundless or Infinite?

It may be enquir'd also what Mr. Lock means when he speaks of our multiplying the Acts and Objects of God's Power, &c. in our Thoughts, with all the Infinity of endless Number. If our Thoughts can multiply them with all the Infinity of endless Number,
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Number, how are they narrow Thoughts, as Mr. Lock often says they are? Besides, he says they may be surmounted and exceeded, which they cannot be, after that we have multiply’d them with all Infinity of endless Numbers; for Infinity cannot be exceeded.

Lastly, I am not satisfied, that we can have no other Idea of the Infinity of God’s Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, but what carries with it some Reflexion on the Number and Extent of the Acts and Objects of those Attributes; for those Perfections of Infinite Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, would have been in God, though there had been no Acts or Objects of them.

CHAP. III.
Of the Idea of God.

That of a God is such an Idea as is agreeable to the common Light of Reason, and naturally deducible from every Part of our Knowledge: For the visible Marks of extraordinary Wisdom and Power appear so plainly in all the Works of the Creation, that a rational Creature, who will but seriously reflect on them, cannot miss the Discovery of a Deity. Thus Mr. Lock, Essay, l. i. c. 4. §. 9.

Observations.

I am far from questioning the Truth of any thing of this. I only take occasion here to intimate, that I cannot but agree with those that think, that Mr. Lock and others, had done better, if they had not amus’d the World so much with the Term Idea as they have done. And Mr. Lock’s using it so much in his Essay, seems not to be very consistent with his Promises and Profession in the Preface or Epistle to the
the Reader, p. 4. where his Words are these. My appearing in Print being on purpose to be as useful as I may, I think it necessary to make what I have to say as easie and intelligible to all sorts of Readers as I can. Now there are that think, that Mr. Lock had made his Essay more easie and intelligible to all sorts of Readers, if he had made use of other Terms, and not fill'd every Page almost with the mention of Ideas. Yea, not only others are of that Opinion, but I might appeal to Mr. Lock himself, if he be of the same Mind that he was when he writ his First Letter, where, p. 127. speaking of his Essay, l. 4. c. 10. he hath these Words, I thought it most proper to express my self in the most usual and familiar way, to let it the easier into Mens Minds by common Words, and known Ways of Expression: And therefore, as I think, I have scarce us'd the Word Idea in that whole Chapter, but only in one place. Here Mr. Lock says plainly, that he therefore scarce us'd the Word Idea in that Chapter, that he might let things the easier into Mens Minds: And then why did he not likewise forbear the use of it in other Chapters, especially when he had engag'd to his Reader, that he would make things as easie and intelligible to all sorts of Readers as he could; and here also confesses, that things are let more easily into Mens Minds by common Words, and known or familiar Ways of Expression.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Worship of God, and of the Heart.

GOD is to be worship'd in Spirit and in Truth, with Application of Mind, and Sincerity of Heart. In publick Assemblies, where some Actions must be open to the View of the World, all that can appear.
appear and be seen is to be done decently, and in Order, and to Edification. Decency, Order, and Edification, are to regulate all the publick Acts of Worship. Praises and Prayer humbly offer’d to God, is the Worship he now demands, and in these every one is to look after his own Heart. Mr. Lock Reasonable of Christian. p. 286, 287. 'Tis his peculiar Care of Mankind, most eminently discover’d in his Promises to them, that shews his Bounty and Goodness; and consequently engages their Hearts in Love and Affection to him. This Oblation of an Heart fixed, with Dependence and Affection on him, is the most acceptable Tribute we can pay him, the Foundation of true Devotion, and Life of all Religion. Ibid. p. 248. Thus Mr. Lock.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. Lock says very well, That in Publick Assemblies all things are to be done decently; but it is also true, that in Private or Secret Prayer, a Decent or Reverent Gesture is to be used. St. Peter kneeled down, and cried, or pray’d, Acts 9. 40. I bow my Knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, says St. Paul, Ephes. 3. 14. Yea our Lord himself, St. Luke 22. 41. did the same.

In like manner, when Mr. Lock says, that Praises and Prayer are the Worship which God now demands, it is true that they are Parts of it; but there are other Parts of it, as sitting at his Feet, and hearing his Word, and so devout receiving the Sacrament, swearing by his Name, when we are lawfully call’d to it, &c. In all which we must chiefly look after the Heart, it being that which God principally regards: Indeed he regards nothing where it is wanting. The Heart must bear the greatest Part in every Service, though (as I said) a Reverent outward Gesture is to be used also.
CHAP. V.

Of the Works of God; of the Creation particularly; also of the Image of God.

The Works of Nature shew the Wisdom and Power of God. Mr. Lock Reasonab. of Christian. p. 248. The infinite omnipotent Creator of all things out of nothing, &c. The Third Letter, p. 152. You will say, Is it not impossible to admit of the making any thing out of nothing, since we cannot possibly conceive it? I answer, No; because it is not reasonable to deny the Power of an infinite Being, because we cannot comprehend its Operation. We do not deny other effects upon this ground, because we cannot possibly conceive the manner of their Production. We cannot conceive how Thought (or any thing but Motion in Body) can move Body: and yet that is not a Reason sufficient to make us deny it possible, against the constant experience we have of it in our selves in all voluntary Motions, which are produc'd in us only by the free Thoughts of our own Minds. 'Tis an over-valuing our selves, to reduce all to the narrow measure of our Capacity, and to conclude all things impossible to be done, whose manner of doing exceeds our Comprehension; Essay, l. 4. c. 10. §. 19. When the thing is wholly made new, so that no part thereof did ever exist before, as when a new Particle of Matter doth begin to exist in rerum natura, which had before no Being, we call it Creation; Essay, l. 2. c. 26. §. 2. Adam being the Son of God, S. Luke 3. 38: had this part also of the Likeness and Image of his Father, viz. that he was immortal; Jesus Christ being also the Son of God, was, like his Father, immortal. The great Evidence that Jesus was the Son of God, was his Resurrection, Acts 13. 32; 33. Then the Image
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of his Father appear'd in him, when he visibly enter'd into the state of Immortality. And that Immortality is a part of that Image wherein these (who were the immediate Sons of God, so as to have no other Father) were made like their Father, appears probable, not only from the places in Genesis concerning Adam, above taken notice of; but seems to me also to be intimated in some Expressions concerning Jesus the Son of God, in the New Testament. Reasonab. of Christian. p. 202, 203, 207. Thus Mr. Lock.

Observations.

I agree with Mr. Lock, That Immortality is part of that Image of God in which Adam was created; but as to Christ, he, as Man, was not made like his Father in that part of his Image, till he was raised from the Dead; for before that, as Man, he was mortal. As Man he did partake of our Infirmities, and was in all things made like unto us, only without Sin; and so he was made like us, being mortal. He was indeed made Man for the suffering of Death, Heb. 2. 9. which he did; for it follows in the same Verse, that By the grace of God be tasted death for every man; wherefore God highly exalted him, and crown'd him with Glory, Honour, and Immortality.

The first place in the New Testament which, according to Mr. Lock, intimates that Immortality is a part of that Image wherein Christ, as Man, was made like his Father, is Col. 1. 15. where he is call'd The Image of the invisible God, and the first-born of every Creature. But how appears it that he is call'd so as Man? Certainly, as God, he is most properly the Image of the invisible God. But you will say it follows, the first-born of every Creature; and so he is spoken of in this place as a Creature, i. e. as Man. To which I answer; 1. Suppose I should grant that the
the Apostle speaks of him as a Creature in this latter Expression, doth it follow that he must speak of him as such in the former? Might he not call him the Image of the invisible God, as God; and the first-born of every Creature, as Man? 2. I do not grant that the Apostle in these words, the first-born of every Creature, speaks of him as Man. The Meaning may be, that he was begotten of the Father before any Creature whatsoever did exist; and therefore it immediately follows, ver. 16, 17. By him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible, whether Thrones or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers, all things were created by him and for him. He is before all things, and by his all things consist. Which agrees with S. John 1. 2, 3. The Word was in the beginning with God. By him all things were made, and without him was not as much as any one thing was made that was made. And we are told, ver. 1. that this Word was God. These words therefore, The first-born of every Creature, do not hinder but that the former words, Who is the image of the invisible God, were spoken of Christ as God; and then they make not for Mr. Lock's purpose, who would have him here call'd the Image of the invisible God as he is Man. I know that Mr. Lock faith, that the words The first-born of every Creature are explain'd ver. 18. where he is term'd The first-born from the dead. But I conceive that these are distinct things; and that we need look no farther for the Explication than ver. 17. He is the first-born of every Creature, ver. 15. i.e. He is before all things, v. 17.
C H A P. VI.

Of Christ.

THE Son of God whilst cloath'd in Flesh was subject to all the Failties and Inconveniences of Humane Nature, Sin excepted. Mr. Lock, Essay, l. 3. c. 9. §. 23. Christ, after a Life illustrious in Miracles and good Works, attended with Humility, Meekness, Patience, and Suffering, and every way concomtable to the Prophecies of him, was lead as a Sheep to the slaughter, and with all Quiet and Submission brought to the Cross, though there were no guilt or fault found in him. Reason of Christian. p. 61. Christ's coming into the World was not for such an end as the over-turning the measures of Right and Wrong, and thereby introducing and authorizing Irregularity, Confusion, and Disorder in the World; but, on the contrary, to reform the corrupt State of degenerate Man, and out of those who would mend their Lives, and bring forth fruit meet for Repentance, ered a new Kingdom. Ibid. p. 215. The chief end of his Coming was to be a King; and as such, to be received by those who would be his Subjects in the Kingdom which he came to ered. Ibid. p. 217. Thus Mr. Lock.

OBSERVATIONS.

What means Mr. Lock when he says, The Son of God was cloath'd with Flesh? Is it his Meaning, that the eternal Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity, was cloath'd with Flesh? If so, it was to be with'd that he would do that Justice to himself, plainly to declare it, and thereby remove out of mens minds the Jealousies they have of him as to this Point.
Mr. Lock's Religion, &c. 21

It may be enquir'd also, what he means by that Expression, Whilst clothed in Flesh? As there was a time before the Son of God was incarnate or cloth'd with Flesh, so hath he after his Incarnation ceas'd to be cloth'd with it? Particularly, Will Mr. Lock say that he was not cloth'd with it after his Resurrection? If so, I ask whether he will not plainly contradict our Blessed Saviour, who told his Disciples, after his being risen from the Dead, that he had Flesh and Bones, S. Luke 24. 39. It may then concern him to explain himself as to this also.

Mr. Lock's Meaning also is not very plain, when he says, that the chief End of Christ's coming was to be a King, and to be receiv'd as such. It is most true, that the Prophets foretold that he should be a King; and it may be said, that he came to fulfil the Prophecies that had been of him, as it is also true that he was a King. But I do not remember that it is said, that the chief End of his coming was to be a King. It is written, that he came into the World to save Sinners, to seek and to save that which was lost, that whatsoever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting Life; that he was manifested to take away our Sins, and to dissolve the works of the Devil. 1 John 3. 5, 8. that he appear'd to put away Sin by the sacrifice of himself, Heb. 9. 26. And when Pilate ask'd him, whether he was a King? he did not answer, For this cause came I into the World, that I might be a King; but, For this cause I came into the World, that I should bear witness to the Truth, S. John 18. 37. Among these several Ends, I do not find the being a King expressly mention'd for one (as every one of these is) much less is it call'd the chief End. Finally, Mr. Lock himself, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 241. mentions something else as the great End. His words are, Pardon and Forgiveness of Sins, and Salvation by him, was the great End of his coming.
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CHAP. VII.

Of our Advantages by Christ.

It will possibly be ask'd, What Advantage have we by Jesus Christ? Answ. 1. He found the World in a state of Darkness and Error, in reference to the true God; but the clear Revelation he brought with him dissipated the Darkness, made the one invisible true God known to the World. 2. A clear knowledge of their Duty was before wanting to Mankind; but now there needs no more, but to read the inspired Books: all the Duties of Morality lie there clear and plain, and ease to be understood. There is not, I think, any of the Duties of Morality, which he has not somewhere or other, by himself and his Apostles, inculcated over and over again to his Followers in express terms. 3. The outward Forms of worshipping the Deity, wanted a Reformation: to this also our Saviour brought a Remedy in a plain, spiritual, and suitable Worship. 4. Another great Advantage received by him, is the great Encouragement he brought to a vertuous and pious Life, great enough to surmount the Difficulties and Obstacles that lie in the way to it, viz. by bringing Life and Immortality to light, and by putting into the Scale, on the side of Virtue, an exceeding and immortal weight of Glory. 5. One Advantage more we have by Jesus Christ, is, the promise of Assistance; If we do what we can, he will give us his Spirit to help us to do what and how we should. Thus Mr. Lock, Reason of Christian. p. 257, 263, 267, 284, 285, 286, 287, 290, 291, 297. See also p. 234.

Observations.

Here where Mr. Lock is treating purposely and largely of the Advantages that we have by Christ, it is justly thought strange, that he should not once make
make mention of his being a propitiation through faith in his blood, Rom. 3:25. A propitiation for our Sins, yea also for the sins of the whole World, 1 Joh. 2. 2. Our having Redemption through his Blood, the forgiveness of Sins, Eph. 1. 7. Col. 1. 14. Such an unconceivable Advantage as this that we have by him, should not have been forgotten. If Mr. Lock say, that otherwhere in his Reasonableness of Chri-
tianity he doth mention our Redemption by Christ, I grant it; but, 1. I do not at present remember that he any where in it mentions Redemption through his blood. 2. If he do speak of it otherwhere, how easie had it been for him to have nam’d it here among other Advantages, and to have referr’d his Reader to the places where he had spoken of it? If Mr. Lock say again, that he set down as much as his Argument requir’d; I answer, That he did not: Having moved the Question, What Advantages we have by Christ? and making it his business to answer it, his Argument requir’d that such a transcendent Advan-
tage as this should not have been omitted.

The truth is, innumerable are the Advantages that we have by Christ; so that it would not have been expected that he should give an account of them all. To instance in some; Beside the Benefits mention’d above, we have by him Vocation, Repentance, Justifi-
cation, Peace with God, Adoption, Sanctification, Audience of our Prayers, Acceptance of our Persons, Victory over Persecutions, Afflictions, and Death it self, Salvation or Glorification, &c. And therefore that Mr. Lock, though he intimates that our Advan-
tages by Christ are great and many, should inflict only upon four or five, and overlook all the rest, espe-
cially that he should take no notice of that which is the foundation of many of the other, viz. Christ’s redeeming us by his Blood, and being the Propitiation for our Sins, is thought strange by others, what-
soever he himself may think of it.
An Account of our Redemption. Ibid. p. 160. Our Saviour was the Just One, Acts 7. 57. and 12. 14. who knew no Sin, 2 Cor. 5. 21. who did no Sin, neither was guile found in his mouth, Ibid. p. 208. In the Precepts of Christ there is nothing too much, nothing wanting, but they are such a compleat Rule of Life, as the wisest men must acknowledge tends entirely to the good of Mankind; and that all would be happy if all would practice it. Ibid. p. 285. Thus Mr. Lock.

OBSERVATIONS.

Both the places out of the Acts in which our Saviour is still'd the Just One, are misquoted; whether through the Author's Fault, or the Printer's, I know not. Instead of Acts 7. 57. read Acts 7. 52. and Acts 3. 14. instead of Acts 12. 14.

Mr. Lock speaking of the Advantages that we have by Christ, largely sets forth the Excellency of the Precepts, or Rule of Morality, which he hath left us in the New Testament. Such a Body of Ethics I think no body will say the World had before our Saviour's time: So Mr. Lock, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 273. Again, Where was there any such Code that Mankind might have recourse to as their unerring Rule, before our Saviour's time? Ibid. p. 275. And certainly this is a Subject which Christian Writers, both Ancient and Modern, have insisted much upon; I mean, the Excellency of the Precepts of Christ; but I conceive that we are to understand them so, as that they had no design to disparage the Precepts or Rules for holy living which are left us in the Old Testament. The Jews were not without their Code of excellent Laws, to which they might have Recourse as to an unerring Rule. None will have the Confidence to deny that the Writings of Moses and the Prophets, and other inspired Persons, do contain many excellent Instructions for the regulating Men's Lives
Lives and Manners. Yea, doth not our Saviour himself, and likewise the Apostles, urge several Duties in the Words of the Old Testament, and making use of its Authority? I shall instance only in the two great Precepts of Doing as we would have others do to us, and Loving Enemies. All things whatever ye would have Men do to you, do ye also to them; for (says our Saviour) this is the Law and the Prophets. S. Matt. 7. 12. And then for Loving Enemies. If thine Enemy hunger feed him, if he thirst give him drink, for doing this thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, says S. Paul; Rom. 12. 20. transcribing the words of Prov. 25. 21, 22. as they are faithfully translated by the Septuagint. Here then S. Paul, in the very words of Prov. 25. prefleth upon his Romans this great Command, to love Enemies, to love them not in Word and in Tongue, but in Deed and in Truth, to testify it by relieving them in their Necessity; and then to encourage them to do this, he sets before them the Benefits of it: 1. They would perform an act of Charity to their Enemy, melt him, and reduce him to a better Mind. 2. They would gain a Friend instead of an Enemy; instead of Hatred Returns of Love. 3. Solomon adds, That God also would reward them; Thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord shall reward thee, says Solomon. And, this excellent Lecture he here reads us, may, I think, be call'd (in the Words of an ancient Writer) the top of Philosophy. I only add, That these are the like Commands to love Enemies, and testify that Love by doing them good; in Exod. 23. 4; 5.
An Account of

CHAP. X.

Of the Name Christ; also of his Offices and Kingdom.

Christ is us'd by the Evangelists and Apostles, in several places, for a proper Name, particularly by S. Luke, as Act. 2. 28. 3. 6, 20. 4. 10. 24. 24, &c. In two of these places it cannot, with good sense, be taken otherwise, for if it be not in Act. 3. 6. and 4. 10. us'd as a proper Name, we must read those places thus; Jesus the Messiah of Nazareth. And I think it is plain in those others cited, as well as several other places of the New Testament. Mr. Lock, Second Vindicat. of the Reasonab. of Christian, p. 374. The three Offices of Priest, Prophet, and King, are in Holy Writ attributed to our Saviour, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 217. Christ publish'd the Kingdom of the Messiah, that is, his own Royalty, under the Name of the Kingdom of God, and of Heaven, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 73. He spake of the Kingdom of Heaven, sometimes in reference to his appearing in the World, and being believ'd on by particular Persons; sometimes in reference to the Power should be given him by the Father at his Resurrection, sometimes in reference to his coming to judge the World at the last day, in the full Glory and Completion of his Kingdom, Ibid. Christ's Obedience and Suffering was rewarded with a Kingdom, Ibid. p. 208. Thus Mr. Lock.

OBSERVATIONS.

Whether Christ be us'd in Scripture as a proper Name or no, is not material; but because Mr. Lock insists upon it, it may not be amiss to examine briefly how he proves it. He says, that Christ is us'd as a proper
proper Name, Act. 2. 28. 3. 6. 20. 4. 10. 24. 24. &c.
But I ask, How does that appear? 1: In two of these
places (says he,) it cannot with any good sense be tak-
en otherwise; for if it be not in Act. 3. 6. and 4. 10.
us’d as a proper Name, we must read those places
thus; Jesus the Messiah of Nazareth. 2. I think it
is plain in the other places cited. Thus Mr. Lock.
But to the former I say, What if we read those pla-
ces thus, Jesus the Messiah of Nazareth, i.e. Jesus
the Messiah that was of Nazareth; is not this good
sense? Besides, these Texts might have been produc’d
rather to prove the contrary, for in them his proper
Name is express’d, viz. Jesus, to which is super-
added this of Christ, given him from his Unction.
As to the latter, it is enough to say, that Mr. Lock’s
Word will scarce pass for a sufficient Proof. But
farther, the other places are Act. 2. 38. (not 28. as
it is misquoted in Mr. Lock) 3. 20. 24. 24. Now it
is so far from being plain that Christ is us’d in them
as a proper Name, that there is no ground at all to
think that it is: yea, as to Act. 2. 38. and 3. 20.
there is ground to think the contrary. That which
Mr. Lock adds (Second Vindicat. p. 375.) that long
before the Acts were writ the name of Christ did de-
ote the Person of our Saviour as much as Jesus, is
nothing but what every one knows; and therefore
in vain doth he trouble either Chronologers, or Sue-
tonius and Tacitus, about it. But how doth he prove
that it denoted the Person of our Saviour as a proper
Name? or if it did, doth that prove that it is us’d
as a proper Name in those places of the Acts?
When Mr. Lock says, that Christ’s Obedience and
Suffering was rewarded with a Kingdom, it must be
understood of that Kingdom or Power which was
given him by God the Father at his Resurrection;
for, that he was a King before his suffering Death,
Mr. Lock does not deny.

C H A P.
BELIEVING Jesus to be the Son of God, and to be the Messiah, was the same thing. The Jews, Luke 22. 70. asking Christ, Whether he was the Son of God; plainly demand of him, Whether he were the Messiah: which is evident by comparing that with the three preceding Verses. They ask him, ver. 67. Whether he were the Messiah? He answers, If I tell you, you will not believe; but whithersoever he shall be in possession of the Kingdom of the Messiah, express'd in those words, Hereafter shall the Son of Man sit at the right hand of the Power of God. Which made them all cry out, Art thou then the Son of God? i.e. Doest thou then own thyself to be the Messiah? To which he replies, Ye say that I am. This was the common Signification of the Son of God. Mr. Locke, Reas. of Christian. p. 34, 35. Confessing Jesus to be the Son of God, is the same with confessing him to be the Messiah; these two Expressions being understood among the Jews to signifie the same thing. Ibid. p. 96. Messiah and Son of God were synonymous Terms at that time among the Jews. Ibid. p. 50. The Son of God and the Messiah are one in Signification. Second Vindicat. of the Reas. of Christian. p. 353. The Answer of our Saviour; set down by S. Matthew chap. 26. 64. in these words Thou hast said; and by S. Mark chap. 14. 62. in these I am; is an Answer only to this Question, Art thou then the Son of God? and not to that other, Art thou the Messiah? which preceded, and he had answer'd to before; though Matthew and Mark contralting the Story, set them down together, as if making but one Question, omitting all the intervening Discourse. Whereas 'tis plain out of S. Luke, that they were too difficult.
distinct Questions, to which Jesus gave two distinct Answers. In the first whereof, he, according to his wonted Caution, declin’d saying in plain express words, that he was the Messiah; though in the latter he own’d himself to be the Son of God. Reaonab. of Christian. p. 144, 145. Thus Mr. Lock.

OBSERVATIONS.

Here I conceive it will not be very easy to reconcile that which Mr. Lock says p. 34, 35. and elsewhere, with that which he hath p. 144, 145. He says p. 34, 35. That the Jews asking Christ whether he were the Son of God, plainly demand of him whether he was the Messiah; and again, They cry out, art thou the Son of God? i.e. Dost thou then own thy self to be the Messiah? So that here Mr. Lock plainly makes Art thou the Son of God? and, Art thou the Messiah? one and the same Question. And yet p. 145. he says expressly, that they are two distinct Questions, to which Jesus gave two distinct Answers. Yea, he appeals to one and the same Evangelist, S. Luke, for the truth of both these. It is evident by comparing Luke 22. 70. with the three preceding Verses, that the Jews asking whether he were the Son of God, demand’d of him whether he were the Messiah; says Mr. Lock p. 34. It is plain out of S. Luke, that they are two distinct Questions, says he p. 145. And indeed it is very plain out of S. Luke, that they are two distinct Questions, not only from our Saviour’s giving two distinct Answers to them, but also from hence, that they ask’d the former Question touching his being the Messiah of their own accord; the latter, whether he was the Son of God, upon occasion of his mentioning his sitting at the right hand of the Power of God, S. Luke 22. 69. I might add, That I question whether they would have accounted it Blasphemy, if he had answer’d affirmatively to the former Question,
Question, as they did when he own'd himself to be the Son of God. This directly overthrows all that Mr. Lock faith about the Son of God, and the Messiah, as being synonymous terms, or one in signification; for if they be Expressions of one and the same signification, these two, Art thou the Messiah? and Art thou the Son of God? cannot be distinct Questions, as (according to Mr. Lock) 'tis plain out of S. Luke that they are. No man will say that Art thou the Christ? and Art thou the Messiah? are two distinct Questions, because Messiah and Christ are known to signify the same thing; and if the Son of God and the Messiah did likewise signify the same thing, those other could not be said to be two distinct Questions. And therefore Mr. Lock must either retract this, that 'tis plain out of S. Luke that Art thou the Messiah? and Art thou the Son of God? are two distinct Questions; or else renounce his beloved Notion, which takes up a great part of his Reasonableness of Christianity, that the Son of God, and the Messiah, are synonymous terms, and one in signification, though not in sound.

The truth is, the account which Mr. Lock himself gives of the signification of the Son of God, and of the Messiah, is sufficient to overthrow that Notion of his. In his Reasonab. of Christian. p. 30. Mr. Lock having alledged those words, The Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ, John i. 42. tells us, that Christ is but the Greek name for the Hebrew Messiah, and that both signify the Anointed. So p. 216. he says, The Faith required was, to believe Jesus to be the Messiah, the Anointed. He was anointed to three great Offices, viz. of Priest, Prophet, and King; see him p. 217. Concerning the other Title, the Son of God, he says; p. 303. Who being conceived in the Womb of a Virgin (that had not known Man) by the immediate Power of God, was properly the Son of God; for which he cites Luk. i. 35. According to Mr
Mr. Lock then, the Son of God signifies our Saviour's having been conceived in the Womb of a pure Virgin by the immediate Power of God, whereas Messiah signifies his being anointed to the Offices of a Priest, a Prophet, and a King. Since then, by his own confession, these Titles have two so different Significations, how he can say, and defend, that they are one in signification, I know not.

If when he says that they are synonymous Terms, Expressions of the same thing, one in Signification, &c., his meaning was only this; that the same Person is express'd or signify'd by them; that both these Titles agree to the same Person; or, that the same Person is both the Son of God and the Messiah; there would be no Controversie as to it: for, it is that which was never question'd. But Mr. Lock will not be satisfied with this, as appears from his Reasonableness of Christianity, and the two Vindications of it, especially the latter. For it was acknowledg'd more than once, that the Titles agree, or are apply'd to the same Person; and yet he is so far from acquiescing, that he disputes the Point as earnestly as ever. See Second Vindication, p. 349, &c.

CHAP. XII.

Of two Natures in one Person, and of the Trinity.

Do not remember that I ever read in my Bible either of these Propositions in these precise terms. There are three Persons in one Nature, or There are two Natures and one Person. I do not here question their Truth, nor deny that they may be drawn from the Scripture; but I deny that these very Propositions
are in express words in my Bible; for that is the only thing I deny here. Mr. Lock, Third Letter, p. 224.

Observations.

It is well known how much Mr. Lock complains that he was join'd with the Unitarians. See his Second Letter, p. 7. The World (says he) will be apt to think, that I am the Person who argue against the Trinity, Ibid. p. 24. That I am one of the They and Them that oppose the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 27. I might transcribe much more to this purpose: But might not Mr. Lock do well (instead of complaining of others) to consider whether he himself hath not given the World reason to suspect that he is no Friend to the Doctrine of the Trinity? As by taking no notice of S. Matth. 28. 19. in his Reasonableness of Christianity, where our Saviour being about to leave the Apostles, and to be taken from them to Heaven, and instructing them what they should teach the Unbelieving Nations, and how they were to admit them into his Church, says, Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in (or into) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This lay directly in Mr. Lock's way when he was acquainting us what the Apostles were to preach to Unbelievers; so that it may be justly suspected, that there was some special reason of his omitting it; and particularly, that the reason was, because these three, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are mention'd here. So whereas it is believ'd that this Title, the Son of God, doth in sundry places include or denote that Christ is God; Mr. Lock very studiously and industriously opposeth this: and by so doing, hath likewise given Persons reason to think that he is no Friend to the Doctrine of the Trinity. Thus he contends, that in S. Luk. 4. 41. S. Mar. 3. 11, 12. S. Matth. 16. 16. S. Joh. 11. 27. S. Luk. 22. 70. S. Matth. 27. 54. Acts. 8. 37. the term the Son of God
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God doth not denote our Saviour's being God. See his Second Vindication, p. 361, 362, 363, 364, 366, 367, 368, 369, 374. I shall not consider all that he faith of these Texts, but with reference to S. Luke 22. 70. I would ask him, Whether the Jews understood not this Appellation, the Son of God, so as that it denoted the Person so call'd to be God? And therefore as soon as he had own'd himself to be the Son of God, v. 70. they said, What need we any farther witness for we have heard from his own mouth? ver. 71. We have heard, viz. his Blasphemy, as S. Matthew and S. Mark expound it; Then the High Priest rent his cloaths, saying, that he had spoken Blasphemy, what farther need have we of witnesses? behold ye have now heard his Blasphemy? S. Matth. 26. 65. See also S. Mar. 14. 63, 64. If they had not understood that by owning himself to be the Son of God he had made himself God, how could they say that he blasphem'd? This matter is fully clear'd by S. Joh. 10. 33, 35, 36. The Jews said, For a good work we stone thee not, but for Blasphemy, and because there being a man, makest thy self God. Jesus answered, If your Law call'd them Gods to whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God? Here it is plain, 1. That the Jews made Christ to be a Blasphemer, because being a Man he made himself God. 2. That according to them, he made himself God, by saying that he was the Son of God. 3. That our Saviour doth not blame the Jews for making this Inference; but contrarywise, maintains that he did not blaspheme in saying that he was the Son of God, and so God, by alledging the Psalmist's words, I said Ye are Gods. If the Psalmist did not blaspheme in recording these words, I said ye are Gods; how say ye that he whom the Father hath set apart and sent into the World, doth
blaspheme, because he said that he is the Son of God, and so God?

But Mr. Locke most especially gives the World just reason to suspect that he is not a Friend to the Doctrine of the Trinity, in his Third Letter: As, 1. By refusing to follow the friendly Advice that was given him for removing all Jealousies and Suspicion of him as to this particular. He was told, that the way to clear himself, had been by declaring to the World, that he own’d the Doctrine of the Trinity as it has been receiv’d in the Christian Church. But this he would not be persuaded to do, alledging, That he needed not to reply to what was never objected, and clear himself from what was never laid to his Charge. 2. That what was laid upon him, was what he could not do without owning to know what he was sure he did not know. For (says he) how the Doctrine of the Trinity has been always receiv’d in the Christian Church, I confess my self ignorant. Thus Mr. Locke, in his Third Letter, p. 7, 9. To the former of which I say, Suppose it was not objected that he did not favour the Doctrine of the Trinity, yet if it was only insinuated, this was a sufficient Reason why he should clear himself. No Man should be silent in the case of such Insinuation. Now Mr. Locke was not ignorant that this had been insinuated, being so well acquainted with two Discourses, one intituled Some Thoughts concerning the several Causes and Occasions of Atheism, the other Socinianism Unmask’d; both publish’d before that he was put in mind to clear himself. The very Title of the latter doth insinuate it; and if he would see it plainly objected, he may consult p. 82. where are these words: My next Charge against this Gentleman (i.e. Mr. Locke) was this; that those Texts of Scripture which respect the Holy Trinity, were either disregarded by him, or were interpreted by him after the Anunnititarian Mode. And this he is so far from
from denying, that he openly avows it. By which he
bath made it clear, that he espouses that Doctrine of
the Socinians. Here it is plainely laid to his Charge;
and yet Mr. Lock did not think fit, either in his Re-
ply to this Socinianism Unmask'd, nor any where
else, to clear himself, by declaring to the World that
he owns the Doctrine of the Trinity. As to the lat-
ter, that he is ignorant how the Doctrine of the Tri-
nity has been always receiv'd in the Christian Church,
it is not to the purpose: for it was not requir'd of
him that he should declare his owning the Doctrine
of the Trinity as it has been Always receiv'd in the
Christian Church, (the word Always is Mr. Lock's
addition;) it was only mention'd that he should
declare his owning it as it hath been receiv'd in the
Christian Church: and if he had only declar'd his
owning it as it hath been receiv'd in the Church of
England, it would have been judg'd sufficient. There-
fore both these are apparently mere Shifts and Eva-
fions.

2. Mr. Lock gives the World just reason to suspect
that he doth not favour the Doctrine of the Trinity,
by his disputing so largely and earnestly about the
Terms Nature and Person, and his ridiculing that
which had been said for clearing the Sense or Signi-
fication of them. This Dispute takes up no small
part of his Third Letter, (see p. 253, &c. and again
p. 352, &c.) after that he had enlarg'd so much upon
them in his two former Letters: see his First Letter,

Lastly, In the Words that I have transcrib'd out of
this Third Letter, p. 224. he gives the World just
cause to doubt that he is no Friend to this Doctrine.
The words are: I do not here question the Truth of
these Propositions, There are three Persons in one
Nature, or There are two Natures and one Person,
nor deny that they may be drawn from the Scripture;
but I deny that these very Propositions are in express

Words
Words in my Bible. For that is the only thing I deny here. If Mr. Lock had said, I do not question the Truth of these Propositions, nor deny, &c. he might have given some Satisfaction. But here is a dead Fly that makes his Ointment to send forth no good favour, viz. the Word Here added, and that twice. He doth not Here question their Truth, and that is the only thing he denies Here: i.e. for this time, and upon this occasion, he did not think fit to express his questioning the one, or denying the other: but he doth not absolutely say that he doth not question or deny the one or other. He faith, For that is the only thing I deny here; whereby I perceive that Mr. Lock has his priviledg'd Particles, as he says that others have theirs: for what the Particle For doth here I know not.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Scriptures, particularly of the Epistles; also of the Interpretation of them.

The Holy Scripture is to me, and always will be, the constant Guide of my Assent; and I shall always hearken to it, as containing infallible Truth, relating to things of the highest Concernment. And I shall presently condemn and quit any Opinion of mine, as soon as I am shewn that it is contrary to any Revelation in the Holy Scripture. Mr. Lock, First Letter, p. 226, 227. Every true Christian is under an absolute and indispensible necessity, by being the Subject of Christ, to study the Scriptures with an unprejudiced mind, according to that measure of Time, Opportunity, and Helps which he has; that in those Sacred Writings he may find what his Lord and Master hath
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hath by himself, or by the mouths of his Apostles, requir'd of him either to be believ'd or done. Second Vindicat. of the Reason of Christian p. 446. I think it every Christian's Duty to read, search, and study the Holy Scriptures, and make this their great Business. Ibid. p. 201. All that we find in the Revelation of the New Testament being the declar'd Will and Mind of our Lord and Master, the Messiah, whom we have taken to be our King, we are bound to receive as Right and Truth, or else we are not his Subjects. But it is still what we find in the Scripture, what we, sincerely seeking to know the Will of our Lord, discover to be his Mind. Where it is spoken plainly we cannot miss it; where there is Obscurity, either in the Expressions themselves, or by reason of the seeming contrariety of other Passages, there a fair Endeavour, as much as our Circumstances will permit, secures us from a guilty Disobedience to his Will, or a sinful Error in Faith. If he had requir'd more of us in those Points, he would have declar'd his Will plainer to us. Ibid. p. 76. The Holy Writers of the Epistles, inspired from above, writ nothing but Truth, and in most places very weighty Truths to us now, for the expounding, clearing, and confirming of the Christian Doctrine, and establishing those in it who had embraced it. But yet every Sentence of theirs must not be taken up and looked on as a Fundamental Article necessary to Salvation, without an explicit Belief whereof no body could be a Member of Christ's Church here, nor be admitted into his eternal Kingdom hereafter. If all or most of the Truths declared in the Epistles were to be receiv'd and believ'd as Fundamental Articles, what then became of those Christians who were fallen asleep, (as S. Paul witnesses, in his first to the Corinthians, many were,) before these things in the Epistles were revealed to them. Most of the Epistles not being written till above twenty years after our Saviour's Ascension, and some after thirty. Reaso
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of Christian. p. 300. The Epistles resolving Doubts, and reforming Mistakes, are of great Advantage to our Knowledge and Practice. I do not deny but the great Doctrines of the Christian Faith are drop'd here and there, and scatter'd up and down in most of them: But 'tis not in the Epistles we are to learn what are the Fundamental Articles of Faith, where they are promiscuously, and without distinction, mixed with other Truths. We shall find and discern those great and necessary Points best in the Preaching of our Saviour and the Apostles, to those who were yet Strangers and ignorant of the Faith, to bring them in and convert them to it. Ibid. p. 298. Many Doctrines proving and explaining, and giving a farther light into the Gospel, are published in the Epistles to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians: These are all of Divine Authority, and none of them may be disbelieve'd by any one who is a Christian. Second Vindicat. of Reason, of Christian. p. 319. Generally, and in necessary Points, the Scriptures are to be understood in the plain direct meaning of the Words and Phrases, such as they may be supposed to have had in the mouths of the Speakers. Reafonab. of Christian. p. 2. He that will read the Epistles as he ought, must observe what 'tis in them is principally aim'd at, and what is the Argument in hand, and how managed; he must look into the drift of the Discourse, observe the Coherence and Connexion of the Parts, and see how it is consistent with itself, and other parts of Scripture. The observing of this will best help us to the true meaning and mind of the Writer. Ibid. p. 294. The Scripture gives light to its own meaning, by one place compar'd with another. Vindicat. of Reafonab. of Christian. p. 22. Thus Mr. Lock,

Observations.

How happy would it be, if Mr. Lock, and I, and all of us, could presently condemn and quit any Opin
tion of ours, so soon as it is shew'd that it is contrary to any part of Scripture.

I do not know any one that affirms that all or most of the Truths contain'd in the Epistles are Fundamental Articles, so necessary, that without an explicit Belief of them, none can be a Member of Christ's Church here, or admitted into his eternal Kingdom hereafter.

Mr. Lock, without any necessity, takes upon him to determine a Chronological Question, and is very positive in his Determination. Most of the Epistles (says he) were not written till above twenty years after our Saviour's Ascension, and some after thirty. But there are who refer our Lord's Ascension to his thirty third Year, and the Date of the First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians to An. Dom. 53, that of the First to the Thessalonians to An. Dom. 49, (making the Second to the Thessalonians to have been written shortly after it,) the Date of S. Peter's First Epistle to An. Dom. 44, as there are who refer that of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and of both the Epistles to the Thessalonians, to An. Dom. 50; so that according to them, there are five Epistles of which it cannot be said, that they were not written till above twenty years after our Saviour's Ascension. If Mr. Lock say, Suppose it were so, that these five were not written above twenty years after the Ascension, it is true still that most of the Epistles were not written till above twenty years after it; I reply, That a Person that is so positive should not barely say it, but also prove it. How knows he, that there are not some other Epistles which were not written after twenty years after Christ's Ascension? As to that which he adds, That some were written after thirty years from our Saviour's Ascension, it may be observ'd, that he is so prudent as not to let us know what Epistles they are. And farther, the Martyrdom of S. Peter, S. Paul, and S. James, is supposed by some not to have
have been after thirty years from our Lord’s Ascension, and their Epistles were certainly all writ before their Martyrdom; and therefore it is impossible that their Epistles should be writ later then the thirtieth year after Christ’s Ascension, it being suppos’d that that their Martyrdom was not later then that year. According to Josc. Scaliger, the Martyrdom of the two great Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul was exactly thirty years after the Lord’s Assension, according to Syncellus nine and twenty, according to Lydias eight and twenty; and S. James’s Martyrdom, according to all of them, preceded theirs: so that if we follow the account of these three great Masters in Chronology, the Epistle of S. James, the two Epistles of S. Peter, and those of S. Paul, could not be writ after the thirtieth year from Christ’s Ascension. There remain the Epistles of S. John and S. Jude, and how will Mr. Lock prove that those were writ after thirty years from our Saviour’s Ascension? One that spent much time and pains in the Study of the Chronology of the Old and New Testament, says, That among all the Apostolick Epistles, there is none about whose time of writing we are so far to seek, as about those of S. John. If Mr. Lock say, That there are who give other Accounts of the time of the writing the First Epistle of S. Peter, and of those to the Corinthians and Thessalonians, as also of the time of S. Peter’s Suffering, and S. Paul’s, different from those that are given here of them, I grant it; but what can be inferred from this Disagreement of Expositors or Chronographers, but the Uncertainty of the time of the Date of the Epistles, which should caution Men not to be so positive in such things, as too many are.

Many of the things which Mr. Lock faith of the Epistles, may be apply’d also to the Gospels. For instance, All or most of the Truths contained in the Gospels are not to be look’d on as Fundamental Articles, so necessary that without an explicit belief of them,
them, none can be admitted into Christ's Church here,
or his eternal Kingdom hereafter. Also Fundamen-
tal Articles are promiscuously, and without distin-
gition, mixed with other Truths in the Gospels. So
he that will read the Gospels as he ought, must ob-
serve what 'tis in them that is principally aim'd at,
find what is the Argument in hand, and how mana-
ged; must look into the drift of the Discourse, ob-
serve the Coherence and Connexion of the Parts, and
see how it is consistent with itself and other parts
of Scripture.

Finally, There are some Fundamental Articles that
are distinguish'd from other Truths in the Epistles:
As in Rom. 10. 9. If thou confess with thy mouth the
Lord Jesus, and believe with thy heart that God
rais'd him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. So
1 Tim. 1. 15. It is a faithful saying, and worthy of
all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the World
to save Sinners. And to Heb. 11. 6. He that cometh
to God, must believe that he is, and that he is a re-
warder of them that diligently seek him.

C H A P. XIV.

Of the Preaching of Christ; as also the
Commission he gave to his Apostles, and
the LXX Disciples, and their Preaching.

T H E Religion our Saviour and his Apostles pro-
sed, consisted in that short, plain, easy, and
intelligible Summary, which I set down in my Rea-
sonab. of Christian. in these words; Believing Jesus
to be the Saviour promised, and taking him now
raised from the Dead, and constituted the Lord and
Judge of Men, to be their King and Ruler. Mr. Lock
Vindicat.
An Account of
Vindicat. of the Reasonab. of Christian. p. 28. As to
our Saviour and his Apostles, the whole aim of all
their Preaching every where was to convince the un-
believing World of these two great Truths: First,
That there was one eternal invisible God, Maker of
Heaven and Earth; and next, That Jesus of Naza-
reth was the Messiah, the promised King and Saviour.
Our Saviour preach'd every where the Kingdom of
God, and by his Miracles declar'd himself to be the
King of that Kingdom. The Apostles preach'd the
same; and after his Ascension, openly avow'd him to
be the Prince and Saviour promised. Ibid. p. 252. By
these and the like places we may be satisfied what it
was that the Apostles taught and preach'd; even this
one Proposition, That Jesus was the Messiah. Ibid.
p. 282. This one Doctrine, That Jesus was the
Messiah, was that which was propos'd in our Saviour's
time to be believ'd as necessary to make a Man a Chris-
tian: The same Doctrine was likewise what was pro-
pos'd afterward in the preaching of the Apostles to
Unbelievers, to make them Christians. Ibid. p. 318.
There is yet one Consideration remaining, which were
sufficient of itself to convince us that it was the sole
Article of Faith which was preach'd; and that is, the
Commissions of those that were sent to preach the Gos-
pel. Our Saviour's Commission, or End of his being
sent, and the Execution of it, both terminated in this,
That he declar'd the good News, that the Kingdom of
the Messiah was come, and gave them to understand
by the Miracles he did, that he himself was he. So
the Commission that he gave the Apostles was, that
they should acquaint their Hearers that the Kingdom
of the Messiah was come; and let them know, by the
Miracles they did in his Name, that he was that King
and Deliverer they expected. And his Commission to
the Seventy whom he sent to preach, was so exactly
conformable to that which he had before given to the
Twelve.
Twelve Apostles, that there needs but this one thing more to be observed to convince any one that they were sent to convert their Hearers to this sole Belief, that the Kingdom of the Messiah was come, and that Jesus was the Messiah. Ibid. p. 289, 290, 296, 299. Accordingly, the preaching of the Apostles everywhere in the Acts tended to this one Point, to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. Reasonab. of Christian. p. 31. What that Word was through which others should believe on Christ. S. Joh. 17. 20. we have seen in the preaching of the Apostles all through the History of the Acts, viz. this one great Point, that Jesus was the Messiah. Ibid. p. 186.

Observations.

It is strange that Mr. Lock should say in so many places, without any Restriction or Limitation, that this, that Jesus is the Messiah, is the sole Doctrine, that one Point or Article, which was preach’d; when he himself otherwhere puts so many Restrictions and Limitations upon it: As, 1. When in his Reasonab. of Christian. p. 195. he says, This was the only Gospel-Article of Faith which was preach’d to them. He doth not say, The only Article of Faith, but the only Gospel-Article. He grants that the Apostles preach’d the Article of one true eternal and invisible God, Maker of Heaven and Earth, (see Reasonab. of Christian. p. 43, 44.) but he doth not call this a Gospel-Article. 2. When he says that it was the only Article necessary to be believ’d to make a Man a Christian, the sole Doctrine, upon their assent to which, or Disbelief of it, Men were pronounced Believers or Unbelievers, and accordingly receiv’d into the Church of Christ. Ibid. p. 195. 3. He limits to the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apostles, to those who were yet Strangers and ignorant of the Faith, to bring them in, and convert them to it. Ibid. p. 298. See also p. 295, and 297.
It is strange also that he should contend so much that this was the only Article of Faith that was preach'd, when he acknowledges that several other Articles were preach'd. Indeed now after his Death, his Resurrection was also commonly required to be believ'd as a necessary Article. So Mr. Lock, Ibid. p. 31. Their great business was to be Witnesses to Jesus of his Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension; which, put together, were undeniable Proofs of his being the Messiah. So the same Mr. Lock, Ibid. p. 188. speaking of the Apostles, who certainly did not fail to execute their great Business, which was to preach, or bear witness to the Articles of Christ's Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, and not only that of his being the Messiah. In the next Page, (viz. 190.) he hath these words, We see what it was that was to be preach'd to all Nations; viz. That he was the Messiah that had suffer'd, and rose from the Dead the third day, and fulfill'd all things that was written in the Old Testament concerning the Messiah, and that those that believ'd this, and repented, should have remission of Sins through this Faith in him. And p. 191. he tells us, that S. Paul preached that Jesus was the Messiah, the King who being risen from the Dead, now reigneth, and shall more publickly manifest his Kingdom in judging the World at the last day. Surely nothing can be more plain, than that by Mr. Lock's own Acknowledgment, the Apostles preach'd the Articles of our dear Lord's Suffering, Rising the third Day, fulfilling all the Prophecies of the Old Testament concerning him, now reigning, and future coming to judge the World, and that those who truly believe and repent, shall receive remission of Sins through Faith in him; and not one Article only. And therefore he very fitly calls them concomitant Articles; since the Apostles, in their preaching, often join'd them with that Article, that Jesus is the Messiah. The belief of Jesus of Nazareth.
reth to be the Messiah, together with those concomitant Articles of his Resurrection, Rule, and coming again to judge the World, &c. Thus Mr. Lock, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 293, 294. To reconcile these Acknowledgments with his Doctrine of one Article, he tryeth many ways, but all in vain. 1. As to the Article of the Resurrection, he would persuade us that the Article of Jesus's being the Messiah and it are but one. These two important Articles are inseparable, and in effect make but one. For believe one and you believe both, deny one of them and you can believe neither. So Mr. Lock in his Second Vindication, p. 309. But every one sees, that all he could say is, that in effect they make but one; and that with the same breath he expressly calls them two Articles. There is therefore no necessity of our insisting upon this, they that please may see what he himself saith in the same Vindication, p. 25, 26. 2. He insists much upon it, that our Saviour's Crucifixion, Death, and Resurrection, are mentioned and made use of as Arguments to persuade men of this Fundamental Truth, viz. That Jesus was the Messiah; they were not propos'd as Fundamental Articles, which the Apostles principally aim'd at, and endeavour'd to convince men of. Second Vindication. p. 268, 269. So again, p. 323. he urges that his Death and Resurrection were Matters of Fact, which happen'd to him in their due time, to compleat in him the Character and Predictions of the Messiah, and demonstrate him to be the Deliverer promised; they were no more necessary to be believ'd to make a man a Christian, than any other part of Divine Revelation, &c. Thus Mr. Lock. But the Question is not, Whether the Crucifixion, Death, and Resurrection of Christ were propos'd by the Apostles as the Fundamental Truths which they principally aim'd at, and endeavour'd to convince their Hearers of; but whether they were not propos'd by them as Fundamental Truths. Whether this,
this, That Jesus is the Messiah, be the principal Article; and, whether it was the only Article preach’d by the Apostles, as necessary to the making Men Christians, are different Questions. Mr. Lock, in his Reasonab. of Christian. p. 31. says expressly of the Article of Christ’s Resurrection, that it was also commonly requir’d to be believ’d as a necessary Article. Where we may observe the Word Also; which denotes, that not only the Article of Jesus’s being the Messiah, but also this of the Resurrection, was commonly requir’d as necessary. And accordingly the same Mr. Lock says presently after, That our Saviour’s Resurrection is necessary now to be believ’d by those who would receive him as the Messiah. It is true, that in a place lately cited, viz. his Second Vindication, p. 323. he says, That the Articles of Christ’s Death and Resurrection are no more necessary to be believ’d to make a Man a Christian, than any other part of divine Revelation; but then it immediately follows, But as far as they have an immediate Connexion with his being the Messiah, and cannot be denied without denying him to be the Messiah: And so he plainly grants, That so far as they have such a Connexion with his being the Messiah, they are necessary to be believ’d to make a Man a Christian: which is as much as we need desire; for thence it follows, that this, that Jesus is the Messiah, was not the sole Doctrine that was preach’d as necessary to be believ’d to that end. I must not forget that Mr. Lock also faith, That our Saviour’s Crucifixion, Death, and Resurrection, were mention’d and made use of to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. If so, these Articles, that Jesus was Crucify’d, that he Died, and that he Rose from Death, were the Premisses; and this, that he was the Messiah, the Conclusion. Now it must be acknowledg’d, that the Premisses are necessary to be believ’d before we can believe the Conclusion: and therefore this makes against
against Mr. Lock, not at all for him. If we cannot believe that Jesus was the Messiah unless we believe that he rose from the dead, (which Mr. Lock confesses,) then the Article of the Resurrection was necessary to be preach'd and believ'd to make a man a Christian. 3. He says that his Resurrection and some other Articles, are put for his being the Messiah, and proposed to be believ'd in the place of it; but I shall have occasion to examine this very shortly.

To proceed then, How can Mr. Lock say, that this, that Jesus was the Messiah, was the only Gospel-Article preach'd by the Apostles to Unbelievers, to bring them to the Faith; when he grants, that in some of their discourse it was omitted, yea and other Articles at the same time insisted on? Thus, in his Reasonab. of Christianity, p. 31. he says, that Christ's Resurrection was sometimes solely insisted on. So in his Second Vindication, p. 284. he plainly confesses, that in the Story of what Paul and Barnabas said at Lystra, the Article of the Messiah is not mention'd; tho' at the same time they preached the Article of the one living God. See also Ibid. p. 307. where he says, that 'tis not at all to be wondered, that his Resurrection, his Ascension, his Rule and Dominion, and his coming to judge the quick and the dead, should sometimes in Scripture be put alone as sufficient Descriptions of the Messiah. Thus Act. 10. our Saviour, in Peter's discourse to Cornelius, when he brought him the Gospel, is described to be the Messiah by his Miracles, Death, Resurrection, Dominion, and co-coming to judge the quick and the dead. Here he grants in express words, that our Lord's Resurrection, Ascension, Dominion, and judging the quick and dead, are sometimes put alone; and if they be sometimes put alone, then the Article of his being the Messiah is sometimes omitted. To the same purpose he says, Ibid. p. 308. These, where they are set alone for the Faith to which Salvation is promised, plainly
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plainly signify the believing Jesus to be the Messiah. Here he grants again, That the four Articles just now mention'd are sometimes set alone, and that the Article of Jesus's being the Messiah is only signify'd (viz. by those four Articles) and not express'd. And indeed this is Mr. Locke's usual Evasion, that tho' other Articles are only insisted on in some places, yet the Article of our Saviour's being the Messiah is signify'd by those Articles, the believing them is put for believing him to be the Messiah, they are proposed to be believe'd in the place of it; see his Second Vindication, p. 307, 324. Where we may be sure, that his Meaning is not, that the other Articles were to be believe'd, and the Article that Jesus is the Messiah was not to be believe'd (tho' the words, Proposed to be believe'd in place of it, are capable of that sense:) but if I do not mistake, his Meaning is, that those Articles were propos'd to be believe'd, that believing them they might believe also, that Jesus was the Messiah, because those were convincing Proofs of this. But whatever his Meaning is, this is manifest, that they were propos'd by the Apostles to Unbelievers, as necessary to be believe'd to make them Christians: And this is sufficient for the Confutation of those who say, that only one Gospel-Article was preached as necessary to be believe'd to that end. Before I leave this, I must not omit to take notice, that Mr. Locke doth assign a Reason why Paul and Barnabas did not mention the Article of the Messiah, which I shall set down in his own words, Having (says he) begun their preaching with that of one living God, they had not time to proceed farther, and propose to them what yet remain'd to make them Christians, but they were by the instigation of the Jews fallen upon, and Paul stoned, before he could come to open to them this other fundamental Article of the Gospel; Thus Mr. Lock, Second Vindication p. 384, who certainly rely'd very much upon his Reader's Credulity.
dulity when he writ this, presuming that he would never consult the History of the Acts. For this, that the Apostles had not time to proceed to the Article of the Messiah, is his mere Fiction, there is no ground for it, nor the least footstep thereof in that History; tho' he hath the Confidence to say that it is apparent; yea the quite contrary appears, that they had time to finish their Discourse, and did finish it. For S. Luke, Act. 14. having set down their words, or the sum of them; v. 15, 16, 17, says v. 18. And with these sayings scarce restrained they the people, that they had not done sacrifice to them. This shews that they had finished their Discourse; as it also shews what effect it had, it did restrain the Multitude from sacrificing to them, but with difficulty. The People were at that time so far from stoning them, or giving them any disturbance or interruption, that they looked upon them as Gods come down to them in the likeness of Men, and would have honour'd them as such. Tho' after this (and how long after, Mr. Lock, with all his Skill in Chronology, cannot tell us) Jews came from Antioch and Iconium, who persuaded the People, and they stoned Paul. See Acts 14. 19.

Lastly, Is it not strange that he should say, that this, that Jesus is the Messiah, was the only Gospel-Article preached by our Saviour and his Apostles; and yet maintain that the Apostles did not in plain and direct words preach this Doctrine, of his being the Messiah, till after his Resurrection, and that our Saviour did not in plain and direct words declare himself to the Jews to be the Messiah, till near the time of his Death? Thus in his Reasonableness of Christianity, p. 55, &c. having observed that there is a threefold declaration of the Messiah, 1. by Miracles, 2. by Phrases and Circumlocutions, that did signify and intimate his coming, tho' not in direct words pointing out his Person; he comes, p. 59, to the third
or last, which is, by plain and direct words declaring the Doctrine of the Messiah, speaking out that Jesus was he; as we see the Apostles did when they went about preaching the Gospel after our Saviour's Resurrection. This was the open clear way, and that which one would think the Messiah himself, when he came, should have taken, especially if it be of that moment, that upon Mens believing him to be the Messiah depended the Forgiveness of their Sins. And yet we see that our Saviour did not, but on the contrary, for the most part made no other discovery of himself, at least in Judea, and at the beginning of his Ministry, but in the two former ways, which were more obscure. Thus Mr. Lock. So that according to him, as our Saviour did not take the open clear way of discovering himself to be the Messiah, so his Disciples did not speak out that he was so, till after his Resurrection. Yea he insists largely upon our Saviour's concealment of his being the Christ. Now I say, Is it not strange that he should dwell so long upon his concealing his being so, and yet maintain at the same time, that his being the Messiah was the only Gospel-Article preach'd by him?

Since Mr. Lock appeals so confidently to the History of the Evangelists, and of the Acts, and abounds so much in Citations out of them to make good his Pretensions, insomuch that some have computed that this takes up about three quarters of his Reasonableness of Christianity, it might have been expected that I should have examined the Texts by him allegd, but that would have swell'd this Tract too much; withal, I may have an opportunity hereafter of doing this, (tho' that which hath been said might save that labor) for it will be easie to shew that many of the places he produceth make indeed against and not for him.

As to the Commission given to the Apostles, how comes it that he takes notice of that which they had when Christ sent them to preach to the Jews, and makes
Mr. Lock's Religion, &c. 53

makes no mention of that which he gave them when taking his solemn Farewell of them, he sent them to preach to all Nations? He ought certainly to have taken notice of the one as well as the other. This Commission we have S. Mat. 28. 19, 20. Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name (or, into the name) of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. The Apostles were to teach adult Persons before they baptiz'd them; and what were they to teach them? Surely the necessary Doctrine concerning those in or into whose Name they were to be baptiz'd; and so concerning the Holy Ghost, as well as touching the Father and the Son. If Mr. Lock will translate / make Disciples, it comes to the same; for they could not be made Disciples without being taught. We see then what their Commission was, viz. to teach the Doctrine of the Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and so to admit Men into the Church by Baptism. And we are sure that they faithfully executed their Commission, and did that which their Lord and Master gave them in charge. Whence it is clearly manifest, what the Apostles were to teach all Nations; and consequently, what they did teach them.

C H A P. XV.

Of the Fall of Adam.

What Adam fell from, was the state of perfect Obedience. By this Fall he lost Paradise, wherein was Tranquility and the Tree of Life, i.e. he lost Bliss and Immortality. The Penalty annex'd to the Breach of the Law stands thus, Gen. 2, 17. In E
the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. How was this executed? In the day he did eat he did not actually die, but his Life began from thence to shorten and waste, and to have an end. Death, i.e. a state of Death and Mortality, enter’d by Sin: Mr. Lock, Reason of Christ, p. 3, 4. By Death here, I can understand nothing but a ceasing to be, the losing of all Actions of Life and Sense. Such a Death came on Adam and all his Posterity by his first Disobedience in Paradise, under which Death they should have lain for ever, had it not been for the Redemption by Jesus Christ: Ibid. p. 6. As Adam was turned out of Paradise, so all his Posterity was born out of it, out of the reach of the Tree of Life; all like their Father Adam, in a state of Mortality, void of the Tranquility and Bliss of Paradise. Ibid. p. 7. Though all die in Adam, yet none are truly punished but for their own Deeds. Ibid. p. 9. Thus Mr. Lock.

OBSERVATIONS.

Expositors are not agreed what Death it is which God threatened to Adam upon his eating the forbidden Fruit. Mr. Lock (if I mistake him not) can by Death here understand nothing but that which we call the Death of the Body, or a natural or temporal Death: And I believe few will deny that this Death was threatened in the words Thou shalt surely die, Gen. 2. 17. The great Objection against this, is that which Mr. Lock intimates, viz. that it is said, In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die; whereas it was above nine hundred years after his eating, that Adam died this Death. But hereto it may be answer’d, 1. That in the day that he did eat (taking the words in the strict sense) this Death became due to him, or he became a Child of Death. God might have said to him as Solomon to Abiathar, 1 Kings 2. 26. Thou art worthy of death, but I will not
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not at this time put thee to death. 2. In that day he became liable to Diseases, which were Harbingers of this Death, which did by degrees weaken the strength of Nature, and at last introduce Death. 3. St. Hierom and Theodoret do testify that Symmachus, instead of Thou shalt surely die, translates Thou shalt be mortal; and the rendering is approved and commended by S. Hierom in Tradit. Hebr. in gen. Now according to it there is no difficulty, for Adam did become mortal that day. 4. Some say that Adam repented, and that upon his Repentance the Execution of the Threatning was respited; as others say that it was respited upon the account of the Remedy which God had prepared, viz. The Seed of the Woman. Lastly, There is no necessity that the words In the day be taken so strictly, we may understand them more largely; viz. At what time thou shalt eat thereof, know assuredly, that thou shalt die the death. As Solomon says to Shimei, On the day thou goest out, and passest over the Brook Kidron, thou shalt know for certain that thou shalt surely die, 1 Kings 2. 37. It could not be Solomon's Meaning, that Shimei should surely die the very same day that he passed over Kidron; for he could not foresee that Shimei would return to Jerusalem the self same day, or that word would be brought to him the self same day that he had passed over; he only tells Shimei, that if he should pass over, he would forfeit his Life, and be certainly put to Death, whencesoever he should please to give order for the execution of the Sentence.

Therefore, notwithstanding the foremention'd Objection, we may conclude, that Adam was to die that Death which we call the Death of the Body, or a natural Death: and thus far Mr. Lock is in the right. The Question is, Whether he be in the right, when he says that by the Death threatned Gen. 2. 17. he can understand nothing but this Death. What thinks he of a Death of Afflictions, outward Sufferings and
An Account of

Calamities? May not this be comprehended under the word Death, Gen. 2? Is not the Word Death taken in this Sense in other places of Scripture? When S. Paul says of himself, that he was in Deaths oft, may we not interpret it in Sufferings oft? See 2 Cor. 11. 23. In like manner, when he says 1 Cor. 15. 31. I die daily, may we not suppose that he had respect to the Afflictions and Sufferings that came daily upon him for the sake of Christ? But most plainly the Word is thus to be understood Exod. 10. 17. where Pharaoh says to Moses and Aaron, Intreat the Lord your God, that he may take away from me this Death only. Here by Death is understood nothing but the Plague of Locusts. With respect to these Afflictions and Calamities, one says, Incipimus enim, si forte nescis, tum mori, cum primum incipimus vivere, & mors cum vita pretendentur. And thus Adam begun to die, i.e. to be liable to the Afflictions and Miseries of Life, that very day that he sinn'd.

But Mr. Locke informs us more particularly what he cannot understand by Death Genesis 2. saying, 1. Some will have it to be a state of Guilt, wherein not only he, but all his Posterity, was so involv'd, that every one descended of him deserv'd endless torment in Hell-fire. 2. They would have it to be a state of necessary sinning, and provoking God in every Action that Men do: see Reasonab. of Christianity, p. 4. 5. whereas he cannot subscribe to either of these significations of the Word Death. But I must acknowledge my self so ignorant, as not to know the Authors of these two Interpretations. It would have been more satisfaction to his Readers, if Mr. Locke had given us the Names of them, together with their express Words, and directed us to the places where we might have found them. But he not having done this, it cannot be expected that any notice should be taken of what he says concerning them. There are who say, that by Death, Gen. 2. we are to understand not
only that natural Death, and that Death of external Afflictions and Sufferings of which we have spoken, but also a spiritual Death, (so they call the loss of so much of the Image of God as consisted in perfect Righteousness and true Holiness, and of that Light and Strength which Adam had before his Fall,) and likewise an everlasting Death. They conceive that all these are comprehended under the Penalty threatned Gen. 2. And if Mr. Locke had disputed against these, I should perhaps have considered his Arguments. It may be said, that he doth argue against those who make everlasting Death to be comprehended in that Threatning; for, that which we call eternal Death, he calls eternal Life in Misery. His words are these: It seems a strange way of understanding a Law, which requires the plainest and direst words, that by Death should be meant eternal Life in Misery. Could any one be supposed by a Law that says for Felony you shall die, not that he should lose his Life, but be kept alive in perpetual exquisite Torments. Thus Mr. Locke, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 5. labouring to expose those who make a double Death both of Body and Soul, not only temporal but also eternal, to be threaten'd to Adam; but it cannot be said that he argues against them, for here is nothing that looks like an Argument. 1. He says, It is strange that by Death should be meant eternal Life in Misery; but instead of Eternal Life in Misery, he should have said Eternal Death in Misery; for a Life in perpetual exquisite Torments and Misery, is more truly a Death than a Life. The Margin of our Bibles, Gen. 2. 17. instead of Thou shalt surely die, hath, Dying thou shalt die; which Words seem very properly to express Mens dying everlastingly. 2. I cannot say that he doth say, but I believe that he would have said, that be who says for Felony thou shalt die, cannot be supposed to mean (not that he should lose his Life, but) that he should be kept alive in
in perpetual exquisite Torments. But the cases are not parallel, for they that expound the Words Thou shalt surely die, of a double Death, say that he should both lose or depart out of this present Life, and also after his Departure suffer those perpetual exquisite Torments. Besides, an earthly Lawgiver, who can only kill the body, when he says Thou shalt die, cannot be supposed to mean that the Person should suffer such Torments; but it cannot be inferred hence, that when the heavenly Lawgiver, who after he hath kill'd is able to destroy both Soul and Body in Hell, says Thou shalt die, he may not fitly be suppos'd to threaten Eternal Death as well as Temporal.

But that which gives greatest Offence is still behind; and that is, that he describes that which we call a natural or temporal Death, not only by losing all actions of Life and Sense, but also by ceasing to be. His words are these: By Death here I can understand nothing but ceasing to be, the losing of all actions of Life and Sense, see Reasonab. of Christian. p. 6. And so again p. 15. This being the case, that whoever is guilty of any Sin should certainly die, and cease to be. That when Men die their Bodies lose all actions of Life and Sense, we need not be told; but ceasing to be is a quite different thing, and according to the known sense of the words can signify nothing but the being annihilated. It will therefore concern Mr. Lock to find out some other Sense of the Words which we know not of; for it seems very strange that he should make Death an Annihilation.

When Mr. Lock says, that none are truly punished but for their own deeds, Reasonab. of Christian, p. 9. we may gather from that which immediately follows, that his Meaning is, that there will be no Condemnation to any one, at the great Judgment, but for his own Deeds; but that Persons have suffer'd otherwise for the Sins of others, there are sundry Instances in Holy Writ, and Mr. Lock here alludes
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edges the Words of the Apostle, affirming that in Adam all die.

C H A P. XVI.


The Law of Nature is a Law knowable by the Light of Nature; i.e. without the help of positive Revelation. It is something that we may attain to the knowledge of, by our natural Faculties, from natural Principles: Mr. Lock, Essay, 1. 1. c. 3. §. 13. The existence of God is so many ways manifest, and the Obedience we owe him so congruous to the Light of Reason, that a great part of Mankind give Testimony to the Law of Nature: Ibid. §. 6. Every Christian, both as a Deist, and as a Christian, is obliged to study both the Law of Nature and the revealed Law, that in them he may know the Will of God, and of Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. Second Vindication, p. 77. The Civil and Ritual part of the Law delivered by Moses obliges not Christians; tho' to the Jews it were a part of the Law of Works; it being a part of the Law of Nature, that Man ought to obey every positive Law of God, whenever he shall please to make any such Addition to the Law of his Nature. But the moral part of Moses's Law, or the moral Law, (which is every where the same, the eternal Rule of Right) obliges Christians, and all Men, every where, and is to all Men the standing Law of Works: Reasonab of Christian. p. 21, 22. No one Precept or Rule of the eternal Law of Right, which is holy, just and good, is abrogated or repealed, nor indeed can be, whilst God is an holy, just and righteous God, and Man a rational Creature.
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The duties of that Law arising from the Constitution of his very Nature, are of eternal obligation; and it cannot be taken away, or dispens’d with, without changing the nature of things, and overturning the Measures of Right and Wrong: Ibid. p. 214. Thus Mr. Lock.

OBSERVATIONS.

It is known to be Mr. Lock’s darling Notion, That there are no innate Ideas, and no innate Law, and consequently, according to him, the Law of Nature is not innate; but he tells us, that the knowledge of it is attain’d by the light of Nature, or, by our natural Faculties from natural Principles. But I would ask him, Whence we have these natural Principles, from which, by our natural Faculties, we attain to the Knowledge of the Law of Nature; for he denies all innate Principles. Will he say then, that we owe them to the Superstition of a Nurset, or the Authority of an Old Woman, or our Educations? for these he mentions Essay, I. i. c. 3. §. 22. and 26. where he is giving an account how Men commonly come by their Principles. If he say this, I would know why he calls those which are taught us by Old Women, or our Nuture, Parents, and School-Mastes, natural Principles. If Mr. Lock please to satisfie us as to these Queries, I may possibly farther consider his Description of the Law of Nature.

Farther, I believe that there have been many that have not made use of the Light of Reason, and the natural Faculties which God hath given them, as they should have done, and withall have not had the advantage of any Revelation, or of being taught, who yet have had some Knowledge of the Duties and Dictates of the Law of Nature, and have assented to them as just and good, as soon as they were proposed to them.
Of Natural and Revealed Religion, or of the Light of Reason, and that of Revelation.

It is not to be wonder'd, that the Will of God, when cloath'd in words, should be liable to that Doubt and Uncertainty which unavoidably attends that sort of Conveyance. And we ought to magnifie his Goodness, that he hath spread before all the World such legible Characters of his Works and Providence, and given all Mankind so sufficient a light of Reason, that they to whom this written Word never came, could not (whenever they set themselves to search) either doubt of the being of a God, or of the Obedience due to him. Since then the Precepts of Natural Religion are plain and very intelligible to all Mankind, and seldom come to be controverted, and other reveal'd Truths which are convey'd to us by Books and Languages, are liable to the common and natural Obscurities incident to Words; methinks it would become us to be more careful and diligent in observing the former, and less magisterial, positive, and imperious, in imposing our own Sense and Interpretations of the latter. Mr. Lock, Essay, l. 3. c. 9. §. 23. Whatsoever Truth we come to the discovery of from the Knowledge and Contemplation of our own clear Ideas, will always be certain to us than those which are convey'd to us by Traditional Revelation: for the Knowledge we have that this Revelation came from God, can never be so sure as the Knowledge that we have from our own clear and distinct Ideas. The History of the Deluge is convey'd to us by Writings which had their Original from Revelation; and yet no body, I think, will say he has as certain and clear a Knowledge of the Flood as
as Noah that saw it, or that he himself would have bad, had he then been alive and seen it. For he has no greater Assurance than that of his Senses, that it is writ in the Book suppos’d writ by Moses inspired, but he has not so great an Assurance that Moses writ that Book, as if he had seen Moses write it; so that the assurance of its being a Revelation is less still than the assurance of his Senses. Ibid. l. 4. c. 18. §. 4. A man ought to hearken to Reason, even in immediate and original Revelation, where it is suppos’d to be made to himself; but to all those who pretend not to immediate Revelation, but are requir’d to pay Obedience, and to receive the Truths reveal’d to others, which by the Tradition of Writings or Word of Mouth are convey’d down to them, Reason hath a great deal more to do, and is that only which can induce us to receive them. Ibid. §. 6. Whatever is divine Revelation, ought to over-rule our Opinions, Prejudices, and Interests. Whatever God hath reveal’d is certainly true, no doubt can be made of it. But whether it be a divine Revelation or no, Reason must judge, which can never permit the Mind to reject a greater Evidence for that which is less evident, or prefer less Certainty to the greater. There can be no Evidence that any Traditional Revelation is of divine Original in the words we receive it, and in the Sense we understand it, so clear and so certain, as those of the Principles of Reason. Ibid. §. 10. No Proposition can be received for divine Revelation, or obtain the Assent due to all such, if it be contradictory to our clear intuitive Knowledge. Ibid. §. 5. No Proposition can be receiv’d for divine Revelation, which is contradictory to a self-evident Proposition. The Third Letter, p. 230. Give me leave to ask your Lordship, Whether where there be Propositions, of whose Truth you have certain Knowledge, you can receive any Proposition for divine Revelation which contradicts that Certainty. Ibid. p. 218. There is one sort of Propositions
that challenge the highest degree of our Assent upon bare Testimony, whether the thing proposed agree with common Experience and the ordinary Course of things or no. The Reason whereof is, because the Testimony is of such an one as cannot deceive or be deceived; and that is of God himself. This carries with it Certainty beyond Doubt, Evidence beyond Exception: This is call'd by a peculiar Name, Revelation; and our Assent to it, Faith, which has as much Certainty as our knowledge it self, and we may as well doubt of our own Being as we can whether any Revelation from God be true. Only we must be sure that it be a Divine Revelation, and that we understand it right. Essay, l. 4. c. 16. §. 14. I think it is possible to be certain upon the Testimony of God, where I know it is the Testimony of God. The third Letter, p. 133. All Divine Revelation requires the Obedience of Faith, and all the parts of it are to be receiv'd with a Docility and disposition prepared to embrace and assent to all Truths coming from God. Reasonab. of Chrifian, p. 302. Natural Religion, in its full extent, was no where that I know taken care of by the force of natural Reason. It should seem that 'tis too hard a thing for unassisted Reason to establish Morality, in all its parts, upon its true Foundation, with a clear and convincing Light. Ibid. p. 268. 'Tis no diminishing to Revelation, that Reason gives it Suffrage too to the Truths Revelation has discovered. The Apostles delivered no Precepts, but such, as tho' Reason of it self had not clearly made out, yet it could not but assent to when thus discover'd, and think it self indebted for the Discovery. Ibid. p. 281, 284. I gratefully receive and rejoice in the Light of Revelation, which sets me at rest in many things, the manner whereof my poor Reason can by no means make out to me. I readily believe what ever God has declared, tho' my Reason find Difficulties in it which I cannot master. The Third Letter, p. 443, 444. Though the Light of Nature gave some obscure glimme-
ring, some uncertain hopes of a Future state, yet humane Reason could attain to no Clearness, no Certainty about it, but it was Jesus Christ alone who brought Life and Immortality to light through the Gospel. Ibid. p. 439. Thus Mr. Locke.

OBSERVATIONS.

Every one must observe how much Mr. Locke in his Essay, speaks on the behalf of Natural Religion; telling us, that the Precepts of it are plain and very intelligible to all Mankind, and seldom come to be controverted; whereas (says he) reveal'd Truths are liable to the common and Natural Obscurities and Difficulties incident to Words, and therefore he recommends the Precepts of natural Religion to our careful and diligent observation. God (says he farther) hath spread before all Mankind such legible Characters of his Works and Providence, and given them so sufficient a Light of Reason, that they to whom this written Word never came could not (whenever they set themselves to search) doubt of the being of a God. Thus Mr. Locke.

But how doth this last, that they could not doubt of the Being of a God, agree with that which he says other where (viz. Essay. l. i. c. 4. §. 8.) concerning the Atheists among the Ancients, and those at the Bay of Soldamia in Brasil, &c. who (if he might be believed) had not as much as any Notion of a Deity? Mr. Locke perhaps will say of them of the Bay of Soldamia and Brasil, that they did not set themselves to search: but, truly he will not say this of those reputed Atheists that were anciantly, among the inquisitive Greeks. In like manner, how can Mr. Locke say that the points of natural Religion were so seldom controverted? Were there no Controversies among the ancient Greeks about things relating to Ethicks or Morality, as well as about those
those that appertain'd to other parts of Philosophy? Were not the several Sects of Philosophers divided about these things as well as about others? Will he say that there were no Controversies among the inquisitive Heathen, about the Nature and Immortality of the Soul, and that the sufficient Light of Reason (of which he speaks) made all clear as to this? No; for contrariwise, he tells us, that Cicero enumerates several Opinions of the Philosophers about it, and also how uncertain Cicero himself was about it, and that Christ alone brought Immortality to light: See the Third Letter, p. 438, 439. So as to Man's chief Good or Happiness, were there no Controversies, no diversity of Opinions, about that? Doth not the same Cicero, Tuscul. Quest. I. 5. vers. fin. take notice of the various Sentiments about it? Yea, doth not Varro apud S. August. de Civit. Dei, I. 19. c. 1. speak of two hundred eighty eight Sects or several Opinions concerning it? I might add, That the legible Characters of God's Works and Providence spread before all the World (of which Mr. Lock speaks) have not prevented all Controversies among Heathens about God himself; and therefore Cicero, in the very beginning of his Books de Natura Deorum, takes notice of the different Opinions about that Subject; De qua tam varie sunt doctissimorum hominum, tamque discrepantes sententiae, &c. I may conclude therefore, that we have little reason to say that the Principles and Precepts of Natural Religion are so plain and very intelligible to all Mankind, and so little controverted, as Mr. Lock would make them to be.

And we have as little reason to be satisfied with that which Mr. Lock says of the Obscurity of the Truths of Revealed Religion. His only reason here is, because they are convey'd to us by Books and Languages, and so liable to the common and natural Obscurities and Difficulties incident to Words. And so a little
a little before, that it is not to be wonder'd that the
Will of God, when cloath'd in Words, should be liable
to that Doubt and Uncertainty which unavoidably at-
tends that sort of Conveyance, Essay, l. 3. c. 10. §. 23.
So then, according to Mr. Lock, Doubt and Uncer-
tainty, Obscurities and Difficulties, unavoidably at-
tend Words; they are not only common, but even
natural to them. And so all the Will of God, all
Revealed Truths, since they are convey'd by Words,
according to him, are obscure, difficult, and uncer-
tain. So that Love God and Love thy Neighbour,
Fast and Pray, Do as you would be done unto, would
have been, according to him, dark or obscure Instru-
tions, if they had all of them been reveal'd only,
and none of them also Precepts of the Law of Na-
ture. So Love your Enemies, Bless them that curse
you, Do good to them that hate you, Pray for them
that persecute you, and Blessed are ye when men shall
reproach and persecute you, and Speak all evil against
you falsely for my sake, for great is your reward in
Heaven; are all dark and obscure. Yea finally, all
that Mr. Lock hath writ is obscure, if this be true,
that Doubt and Uncertainty, Obscurity and Diffi-
culty, do unavoidably attend Words, and are natural
to them; for in Writing he makes use of Words.
Doth not Mr. Lock himself confute this Notion con-
cerning the Obscurity of Words, when he faith that
Christ brought Life and Immortality to light by the
Gospel? (See his Third Letter, p. 439.) for Christ
and his Apostles made use of Words in preaching
the Gospel, as the Evangelists also did in writing it.
And when (Ibid. p. 443.) he so gratefully receiv'd
and rejoic'd in the Light of Revelation, I suppose he
did not judge Revealed Truths to be so dark and ob-
scure as he did when he writ his Essay. If any would
be satisfied about the Law of Nature, and that of
Scripture, and the Plainness or Clearness of them, I
should advise them to read Mr. Hooker Eccles. Pol.
l. 1. §. 12.
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As to the Question, Whether, and how far, Reason is to judge of Revelation, we need not dispute it, since now there is no new Revelation expected, and it is certain that nothing which is already revealed in Holy Writ is contrary to Reason. As to Mr. Lock, he expresses himself very variously in this matter: as, 1. No Proposition can be receiv'd for Divine Revelation, if it be contradictory to our clear intuitive Knowledge, Essay, l. 4. c. 18. § 5. 2. Nothing that is contrary to, or inconsistent with, the clear and self-evident Dictates of Reason, has a Right to be urg'd or assent to as a matter of Faith. Ibid. § 10. 3. No Proposition can be receiv'd for Divine Revelation, which is contradictory to a self-evident Proposition. The Third Letter, p. 230. Perhaps he will say that Contradictory to our clear intuitive Knowledge, and to the clear and self-evident Dictates of Reason, and to a self-evident Proposition, are in effect the same, only different Expressions of the same thing. To which I answer, Suppose it be so, yet if, descending to Particulars, we are uncertain whether such or such Propositions be self-evident or no, of what Use is this Rule to us? According to some, such Propositions are self-evident; but others will not allow that they are: as for instance, this, that the essential Properties of a Man are to reason and discourse, which others reckon among self-evident Propositions, yea Maxims, is flatly deny'd to be such by Mr. Lock in his Third Letter, p. 263.

Mr. Lock, in his Essay, l. 4. c. 18. § 3. distinguishes between Original and Traditional Revelation. The former he also calls Immediate, because it is reveal'd immediately by God; the latter is that which is deliver'd over to others by Word or Writing. He also tells us (Ibid. § 6.) that a Man ought to hearken to Reason even in Immediate and Original Revelation, and in Traditional Reason hath a great deal more to do. But I would ask him, Whether
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Abraham ought to have hearken’d to Reason in that Revelation concerning the offering Isaac. It was Faith, (Heb. 11. 17.) not Reason, that induced him to receive it as a Divine Revelation. Had he consulted Reason, that would have told him positively, that it could not come from God, since it command ed that which was so clearly forbidden, not only by the Laws which God himself had given to Noah, and before him to Adam, but also by the Law of Nature. There could not be any thing more contradictory to the clear and self-evident Dictates of Reason, than this Injunction which Abraham so readily obey’d was.

In his Essay, 1. 4. c. 18. §. 4. he hath these Words; No body, I think, will say that he has as certain and clear a Knowledge of the Flood as Noah that saw it, or that he himself would have had, had he then been alive, and seen it. And I readily grant, that no Man, who understands what he says, will affirm that he has as clear a Knowledge of the Flood, and of the Circumstances of it in every Particular, as Noah had that saw it: but this I shall be bold to say, that I know not but that there may be some who as firmly and certainly believe that there was such a Flood as is describ’d in the Book of Genesis, as if they had been then alive and seen it; as I hope that there may now be some of those blessed ones, who though they have not, with the Apostle Thomas, seen the Print of the Nails, yet do as certainly and firmly believe our Lord’s Resurrection, as if they had seen it.

In the same Essay, 1. 4. c. 16. §. 14. he writes thus, The Testimony of God is call’d by a peculiar Name Revelation, and our Assent to it faith, which has as much Certainty as our Knowledge it self. Where I would have these last Words observ’d, Faith has as much Certainty as our Knowledge it self, because otherwhere Mr. Locke denies all Certainty of Faith.
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C H A P. XVIII.

OF MYSTERIES, OR THINGS ABOVE REASON.

If I could say there were no mysteries in the Holy Scripture: I acknowledge there are to me, and I fear always will be. Mr. Lock, in his First Letter, p. 226, 227. Things are distinguish'd into those that are according to, above, and contrary to Reason. 1. According to Reason are such propositions whose Truth we can discover by examining and tracing those Ideas we have from Sensation and Reflection, and by natural Deduction find to be true or probable. 2. Above Reason are such propositions whose Truth or Probability we cannot by Reason derive from those Principles. 3. Contrary to Reason are such propositions as are inconsistent with or irreconcilable to our clear and distinct Ideas. Thus, the Existence of one God, is according to Reason; the Existence of more than one God, contrary to Reason; the Resurrection of the Body after Death, above Reason. Above Reason also may be taken in a double Sense; viz. above Probability, and above Certainty, and in that large Sense also, contrary to Reason, is, I suppose, sometimes taken, Essay, l. 4. c. 17. §. 23. There being many things wherein we have very imperfect notions or none at all, and other things of whose past, present, or future Existence, by the natural Use of our Faculties, we can have no Knowledge at all; these are beyond the Discovery of our natural Faculties and above Reason, and Reason hath directly nothing to do with them. Thus, that part of the Angels rebelled against God, and therefore lost their first happy Estate, and, that the Bodies of Men shall rise and live again; these, and the like, are beyond the Discoveries of Reason. Ibid. c. 18. §. 7.

F 3 OBSER-
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OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. Locke, in his Second Letter, complains that he is join'd with Unitarians, and the Author of Christianity not mysterious, p. 7, and that therefore the World would be apt to think that he is the Person who argues against the Trinity, and denies Mysteries, p. 24. Wherefore that he might clear himself from this latter Imputation of denying Mysteries, he says, That there are Mysteries in Holy Scripture to him, and he fears that there always will be. But if hereby he only means, that there are some things in Scripture hard to be understood, and which he fears he shall never understand, I know not but that the Author of Christianity not mysterious may say the same.

However, he distinguishes very well of things according to, above, and contrary to Reason; but when, in his Essay, l. 4. c. 18. § 7. he had reckon'd this, that the Bodies of Men shall rise and live again, among things above Reason; in his Third Letter, p. 210. he tells us, that in the next Edition of his Essay he shall change these words, The Bodies of Men shall rise, into these, The dead shall rise. But I shall take farther notice of this, when I reflect upon his Doctrine of the Resurrection.

C H A P. XIX.

Of the Law of Works, and the Law of Faith; also of Justification.

The Law of Works, is that Law which requires perfect Obadience without any Remission or Abatement; so that by that Law, a Man cannot be just, or justified.
justified, without an exact performance of every tittle. The Language of this Law is, Do this and live, Transgress and die; no Dispensation, no Atonement. Under the Law of Works is comprehended also the Law of Nature, as well as the Law given by Moses. Nay, whatever God requires anywhere to be done without making any allowance for Faith, that is a part of the Law of Works. So the forbidding Adam to eat of the Tree of Knowledge, was part of the Law of Works. The Civil and Ritual part of the Law delivered by Moses, was to the Jews a part of the Law of Works; but the moral part of Moses's Law, or the Moral Law, obliges all Men everywhere, and is to all Men the standing Law of Works. But Christian Believers have the Privilege to be under the Law of Faith too, which is that Law whereby God justifies a Man for believing, though by his Works he be not just and righteous; i.e. though he come short of perfect Obedience to the Law of Works. God alone does or can justify or make just those who by their Works are not so; which he doth, by counting their Faith for Righteousness, i.e. for a complete Performance of the Law. The Difference between the Law of Works and the Law of Faith, is only this; that the Law of Works makes no allowance for failing on any occasion. Those that obey are righteous, those that in any part disobey are unrighteous, and must not expect Life, the reward of Righteousness. But by the Law of Faith, Faith is allowed to supply the defect of full Obedience, and so the Believers are admitted to Life and Immortality as if they were righteous. Were there no Law of Works, there could be no Law of Faith. For there could be no need of Faith which should be counted to Men for Righteousness, if there were no Law to be the Rule and Measure of Righteousness which Men fail'd in their obedience to. Mr. Lock, Reasonab. of Christian, p. 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22. The Rule therefore of the Covenant of Works was never abolished.
An Account of tho' the rigour were abated. The Duties enjoyn'd in it were Duties still. Their Obligations never ceased. Ibid. p. 235. The Law of Faith is for every one to believe what God requires him to believe, as a Condition of the Covenant he makes with him, and not to doubt of the Performance of his Promise. Ibid. p. 24. 25. Righteousness or an exact Obedience to the Law, seems, by the Scripture to have a Claim of Right to Eternal Life. Ibid. p. 11.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. Lock, who thinks it our Duty, as far as we deliver any thing for Revelation, to keep close to the Words of the Scripture, (see his third Letter, p. 210.) doth not observe his own Rule when he says, that God justifies a Man for believing; this not being the Scripture-Language, as far as I remember. We are often said to be justified by Faith, and if he will also, just by Faith, as Faith is oft said to be imputed to Men for Righteousness, and God is still the justifier of him that believes, but I do not find that the Scripture useth these Words, that he is the justifier of any Man for believing.

Having said that exact Obedience to the Law seems to have a Claim of Right to eternal Life, Mr. Lock alledges for it Rom. 4. 4. and Revel. 22. 14. See his Reasonab. of Christian. p. 11. In Rom. 4. 4. 'tis said, To him that worketh the reward is not reckon'd of grace, but of debt. In Rev. 22. 14. the Words in our Translation are Blessed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have right to the tree of Life. Mr. Lock adds in the same Character, Which is in the Paradise of God; but nothing of this is in the Text. Besides the Word that is here translated Right is ἄρεία, which (as is well known) signifies Licence or Power, as well as Right, and not only by the Vulgar, but also by the Syriack, Arabick, and Ethiopick.
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Æthiopick, it is rendered Power. And this Signification agrees exactly with the Text, Blessed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have Power or Licence to eat of the tree of Life. In this place therefore there is nothing concerning any Claim of Right, and consequently it is not at all to the purpose: I might have added, that Mr. Lock speaks of exact Obedience to the Law, and perhaps he would not find it an easie matter to prove that by Doing his Commandments here is meant such exact unfinning Obedience. But tho' Rev. 22. 14. will not prove his Claim of Right, yet if he use those words in a larger sense, as they may denote a Right by Promise, I do not deny that his former Text, viz. Rom. 4. 4. may prove it. To him that worketh, the reward (which God is suppos'd to have promised in the Covenant of Works) is reckon'd as debt; he may lay claim to it as his Right by virtue of that Promise. But if he take them in the strict sense, as if exact Obedience had properly merited the Reward, and might have claim'd it of Right, tho' no such Promise or Covenant had interven'd, he will hardly prove that from Rom. 4. Yea our Saviour seems to have determin'd very plainly against such a Claim, S. Luke. 17. 10. When ye shall have done all things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do.

CHAP. XX.

Of Faith in general.

Faith is nothing else but an Assent founded upon the highest Reason. Mr. Lock, Essay, 1. 4. c. 16. §. 14. The Matter of Faith being only Divine Revelation, and nothing else, Faith, as we use the Word (call'd
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(call'd commonly Divine Faith) has to do with no Propositions but those which are suppos'd to be divinely revealed. So that I do not see how those who make Revelation alone the sole Object of Faith, can say that it is a matter of Faith and not of Reason, to believe that such or such a Proposition, to be found in such or such a Book, is of divine Inspiration; unless it be reveal'd that that Proposition, or all in that Book, was communicated by divine Inspiration. Without such a Revelation, the believing or not believing that Proposition or Book to be of divine Authority, can never be matter of Faith, but matter of Reason, and such as I must come to the Assent to only by the use of my Reason. Things beyond the discovery of our natural Faculties, and above Reason, are, when revealed, the proper matter of Faith. Whatever Proposition is reveal'd, of whose truth our Mind, by its natural Faculties and Notions, cannot judge, that is purely matter of Faith. Where the Principles of Reason have not evidenced a Proposition to be certainly true or false, there clear Revelation, as another Principle of Truth, and ground of Assent, may determine; and so it may be matter of Faith. Ibid. c. 18. § 6, 7, 9.

Faith has as much Certainty as our Knowledge it self. Faith is a settled and sure Principle of Assent and Assurance, and leaves no manner of room for Doubt or Hesitation. Essay. 1. 4. c. 16. § 14. To talk of the Certainty of Faith, seems all one to me, as to talk of the Knowledge of Believing; a way of speaking, not easie to me to understand. Bring Faith to Certainty, and it ceases to be Faith. When it is brought to Certainty, Faith is destroy'd; 'tis Knowledge then, and Faith no longer. The Second Letter, p. 95, 96. My Bible, Heb. 10. 22. expresses the highest degree of Faith, which the Apostle recommended to Believers in his time, by Full Assurance. I find my Bible speaks of the Assurance of Faith, but no where, that I can remember, of the Certainty of Faith; though in many places
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places it speaks of the Certainty of Knowledge; and therefore I speak so too, and shall not, I think, be condemned for keeping close to the Expressions of our Bible. The Third Letter, p. 122, 123. I say with Mr. Chillingworth, c. 6. § 3. that I do heartily acknowledge and believe the Articles of our Faith to be in themselves Truths, as certain and infallible, as the very common Principles of Geometry and Metaphysics. But that there is not require'd of us a Knowledge of them, and an Adherence to them, as certain as that of Sense or Science; and that for this Reason, (among others given both by Mr. Chillingworth and Mr. Hooker) viz. that Faith is not Knowledge, no more than three is four, but eminently contain'd in it: so that he that knows believes, and something more; but he that believes, many times does not know; nay, if he doth barely and merely believe, he doth never know. These are Mr. Chillingworth's own Words, c. 6. § 2. That this Assurance of Faith may approach very near to Certainty, and not come short of it in a sure and steady influence on the Mind, I have so plainly declar'd (Essay, I. 4. c. 17. § 16.) that no body, I think, can question it. There I say of some Propositions wherein Knowledge (i.e. in my Sense, Certainty) fails us, that their Probability is so clear and strong, that Assent as necessarily follows it, as Knowledge doth Demonstration, Ibid. p. 124. Herein lies the Difference between Probability and Certainty, Faith and Knowledge; that in all the parts of Knowledge there is Intuition, each immediate Idea, each Step, has its visible and certain Connexion; in Belief, not so; Essay, I. 4. c. 15. § 3. To say that Believing and Knowing stand upon the same grounds, would be, I think, to say that Probability and Demonstration are the same thing. The Third Letter, p. 223. He that says he barely believes, acknowledges that he assents to a Proposition as true, upon bare Probability, Ibid. p. 159. I think it is possible
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possible to be certain upon the Testimony of God, where I know that it is the Testimony of God; because in such a case, that Testimony is capable not only to make me believe, but, if I consider it right, to make me know the thing to be so: and so I may be certain. For the Veracity of God is as capable of making me know a Proposition to be true, as any other way of Proof can be; and therefore I do not in such a case barely believe, but know, such a Proposition to be true, and attain Certainty. Ibid. p. 133. Faith, as contrasted to Reason, is the Assent to any Proposition not made out by the Deductions of Reason, but upon the Credit of the Proposer, as coming immediately from God. Essay, l. 4. c. 18. §. 2. Faith is nothing but a firm Assent of the Mind, which, if it be regulated as is our duty, cannot be afforded to any thing but upon good Reason, and so cannot be opposite to it. He that believes without having any Reason for believing, may be in love with his own Fancies, and seeks not Truth as he ought. Ibid. c. 17. §. 24. Where I want evidence of things, there yet is ground enough for me to believe, because God hath said it. The First Letter, p. 227. S. Paul, in his Epistles, often puts Faith for the whole Duty of a Christian. Reasonable of Christian. p. 199. Thus Mr. Lock.

Observations.

When Mr. Lock says that the Matter or Object of Faith is only Divine Revelation, and nothing else, if by Divine Revelation be meant the whole Scripture, the Historical part of it together with the rest (for all Scripture is given by the Inspiration of God, 2 Tim. 3. 16. writ by Men inspired and guided by his infallible Spirit) it is very true. And as to that which he infers, that then it cannot be said, that it is matter of Faith and not of Reason, to believe that such or such a Proposition to be found in such or such a Book is of Divine
Divine Inspiration, unless it be revealed that that Proposition or all in that Book was communicated by Divine Inspiration, we need not contend much with him about it, since in the place just now alleged'd viz. 2 Tim. 3. 16. we have a Divine Testimony or Revelation that all the Books of Scripture which were writ and received before the writing of the Second Epistle to Timothy (which as is concluded by all was writ very late) are divinely inspir'd.

Mr. Lock sometimes faith, that Faith hath as much Certainty as our Knowledge itself, and that it leaves no manner of Doubt or Hesitation; yet other where he declaims against the Certainty of Faith. Now I would know how he can reconcile himself to himself in this. He says that to talk of the Certainty of Faith seems all one as to talk of the Knowledge of Believing, that Certainty destroys Faith, when it is brought to Certainty Faith is destroyed, 'tis Knowledge then and Faith no longer. For to him to know and be certain is the same thing (see his Second Letter, p. 93) and Certainty the same thing with Knowledge; see his Third Letter, p. 122. Now if this be so, if Certainty and Knowledge are the same thing, then as he says, that to talk of the Certainty of Faith seems all one as to talk of the Knowledge of Believing; so he might have said, that to talk of the Certainty of Knowledge seems all one as to talk of the Knowledge of Knowing, and that to talk of certain Knowledge seems all one as to talk of known Knowing; a way of speaking not easy to be understood. Yea, as often as Mr. Locke useth these Expressions Certainty of Knowledge and Certain Knowledge, so oft he confutes this Fancy of his, that Knowledge and Certainty are the same thing. As when we say a certain Persuasion or a certain Truth, these Expressions imply that there may be a Persuasion or a Truth not so certain; so when we say Certain Knowledge, it seems to imply that there may be a Knowledge not so certain,
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tain. And so when Mr. Lock says, We certainly know, and We have a more certain Knowledge, Essay, l. 4. c. 10. § 6. doth he not plainly imply, that there is a Knowledge less certain? So that it is clear from his own Expressions that Knowledge and Certainty are not the same thing. But that which I chiefly desire to know is, How Mr. Lock will reconcile his denying Certainty to Faith with his saying that Faith hath as much Certainty as our Knowledge it self.

Whereas, Mr. Lock, says that he finds his Bible speaks of the Assurance of Faith, but no where that he can remember of the Certainty of Faith; I desire that he would please to let us know the difference between Assurance and Certainty, or between Full Assurance and Certainty. As to the word ἔγνωσία, Heb. 10. 22. which is translated Full Assurance, I suppose the Translators (if they had pleased) might have rendered it Full Certainty, or Full Persuasion, or Certain Persuasion, as Erasmus and others render it by Certitudo.

As Mr. Lock craves leave to use the Words of Mr. Chillingworth, so he ought to crave his Reader’s Pardon for not transcribing his Words so largely as he ought to have done. For though it sufficiently appears from so much as he hath cited from him, that Mr. Chillingworth makes against, and not for him; yet it would have been more apparent, if he had alleged him more fully. Mr. Chillingworth, as Mr. Lock cites him, says, that there is not require’d of us a Knowledge of the Articles of Faith, and an Adherence to them as certain as that of Sense or Science. In which Words, if by an Adherence to them be meant an Assent to or Belief of them, Certainty is plainly ascrib’d to Belief or Faith, (which Mr. Lock will not allow) though not a Certainty equal to that of Sense or Science. But let us take a view of Mr. Chillingworth’s Words at large; I do (says he) heartily acknowledge and believe the Articles of our Faith.
Faith to be in themselves Truths as certain and infallible, as the very common Principles of Geometry and Metaphysicks. But that there is requir’d of us a Knowledge of them, or an Adherence to them, as certain as that of Sense or Science; that such a Certainty is requir’d of us under pain of Damnation, so that no Man can hope to be in the state of Salvation but be that finds in himself such a degree of Faith, such a strength of Adherence: this I have already demonstrated to be a great Error, and of dangerous and pernicious Consequence. Thus Mr. Chillingworth, c. 6. §. 3. We see now, what it is that this great Man faith; viz. That a Certainty equal to that of Sense or Science is not requir’d of all Men under pain of Damnation, so that no Man can be in a state of Salvation that hath it not. But God may grant that degree of Certainty to some which he doth not require under pain of Damnation of all.

Mr. Lock farther tells us, that there is not requir’d of us a Knowledge of the Articles of our Faith, and an Adherence to them as certain as that of Sense or Science, and that for this reason among others; viz. that Faith is not Knowledge, no more than Three is Four, but eminently contain’d in it; so that he that knows believes, and something more, but he that believes many times does not know; nay, if he doth barely and merely believe, he doth never know. These are Mr. Chillingworth’s own words. Thus Mr. Lock. And I grant that the words Faith is not Knowledge, &c. are Mr. Chillingworth’s; but these, And that for this reason among others, are not his, but Mr. Lock’s own. Mr. Chillingworth would never have offer’d such a Reason to prove that there is not requir’d of us a Knowledge of the Articles of our Faith, and an Adherence to them as certain as that of Sense and Science. He, and other worthy Men of our Church who writ in his time, were not wont to argue so loosely; and withal, he gives it as a Reason of
of something else: see him cap. 6. §. 2. There every
one may also see, that when he says Faith is not
Knowledge, he takes the word Knowledge in a diffe-
rent Sense from that in which he takes it §. 3. where
he speaks of the Knowledge of the Articles of our
Faith. When he speaks of Knowledge of the Arti-
cles of Faith, he, by Knowledge, understands only
an Apprehension or Belief; but when he says Faith
is not Knowledge, he takes the Word properly and
exactly in the Sense in which he uses the Word Sci-
cence. By this time Mr. Lock may see what the
Task is that he hath set himself; viz. He is to prove
this Consequence, Faith is not Knowledge, therefore
there is not requir'd of us under pain of Damnation,
an Apprehension or Belief of the Articles of Faith as
certain as that of Sense or Science!

But, since Mr. Lock mentions Mr. Hooker togeth-
er with Mr. Chillingworth, as if they countenanced
his Notion of Faith and Certainty; I have consider'd
that which they say of this Matter, and find that he
hath no countenance at all from those excellent Per-
sons. He makes Knowledge and Certainty to be the
same thing, and Faith to be only Probability: let
him shew where either Mr. Hooker or Mr. Chilling-
worth doth either of these. He distinguishes between
Assurance and Certainty; yea, he makes full Assu-
rance of Faith to come short of Certainty: I would
know where those excellent Persons do this. He
ridicules the Certainty of Faith, but Mr. Hooker and
Mr. Chillingworth ascribe a Certainty to Faith. They
both of them speak of a Certainty of Evidence, and
a Certainty of Adherence; and when Mr. Hooker
(in his Sermon upon Heb. 1. 4.) says, that this Cer-
tainty of Adherence is greater in us than the other,
he plainly implies, that both the one and the other
Certainty is in us, but not both in the same degree.
And as to Mr. Chillingworth, when he says of this
Hypothesis, that all the Articles of our Faith were re-
vealed
sealed by God, we cannot ordinarily have any rational or acquired Certainty more than moral, (see him c. 1. §. 8.) he grants that we may have a moral Certainty of that Hypothesis. But §. 9. he adds, Yet this I say not, as if I doubted that the Spirit of God being implor'd by devout and humble Prayer and sincere Obedience, may and will, by degrees, advance his Servants higher, and give them a Certainty of Adherence beyond their Certainty of Evidence. But what God gives as a reward to Believers is one thing, and what he requires of all Men, as their duty, is another; and what he will accept of, out of Grace and Favour, is yet another. To those that believe, and live according to their Faith, he gives by degrees the Spirit of Obssignation and Confirmation, which makes them know (though how they know not) what they did but believe: and to be as fully and resolutely es- sur'd of the Gospel of Christ, as those which heard it from Christ himself with their ears, which saw it with their eyes, which look'd upon it, and whose hands handled the Word of Life. If Mr. Lock will say thus much with Mr. Chillingworth, more will not be requir'd of him.

I said that Mr. Lock makes Faith to be only Probability; and I have in this Chapter transcrib'd sundry Passages from him which make this out. Here-in lies the Difference between Probability and Certainty, Faith and Knowledge, says he in Essay, l. 4. c. 15. §. 3. where as Knowledge is in his Sense Certainty, so Faith is Probability. So again, He (says he) that says he barely believes, acknowledges that he assents to a Proposition, as true, upon bare Probability. And again, To say that Believing and Knowing stand upon the same grounds, is, I think, to say that Probability and Demonstration are the same thing. See his Third Letter, p. 159. 223.

Mr. Lock (in his Third Letter, p. 124.) hath these Words: That this Assurance of Faith may a.
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proach very near to Certainty, and not come short of it in a sure and steady influence on the Mind; I have so plainly declar'd (Essay, l. 4. c. 17. §. 16.) that no body, I think, can question it. If you ask in what words he declares it, he tells us, that speaking of some Propositions wherein Knowledge (i.e. in his sense Certainty) fails us, he says, that their Probability is so clear and strong, that Assent as necessarily follows it, as Knowledge does Demonstration. Thus Mr. Lock. But how does he so plainly declare that the Assurance of Faith may approach very near to Certainty, and not come short of it in a sure and steady influence on the Mind, when neither in the Words which he cites, nor in that whole Section out of which he cites them, there is any mention either of the Assurance of Faith, or of Faith it self. He speaks indeed of probable Mediums, the probability of some of which may be so clear and strong, that Assent necessarily follows it; and perhaps he would have us to apply this to the probable Grounds of Faith, for he will not allow the Grounds of Faith to be more than probable. But as he faith of probable Mediums, that they cannot bring us to the lowest degree of Knowledge, so probable Grounds of Faith cannot bring us to the lowest degree of Certainty; and so, according to him, our Faith cannot advance it self above Probability, as was observ'd before.

When Mr. Lock says in his Third Letter, p. 133.

I think it is possible to be certain upon the Testimony of God, where I know that it is the Testimony of God, should he not rather have said, It is impossible for him who knows that God is true, yea Truth it self, not to be certain upon the Testimony of God, provided he know that it is the Testimony of God? And after all, what is this to us who live now? since, according to Mr. Lock, it is impossible for us (unless we had an immediate Revelation from God himself) to know that it is the Testimony of God; and so by this
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this Provizo he makes it impossible for us (without such an immediate Revelation) to be certain upon the Testimony of God, though we should be suppos'd to have a certain knowledge of his Veracity.

CHAP. XXI.

Of Abraham's Faith, and the Faith of those that liv'd before our Saviour's time.

THE Faith for which God justified Abraham, what was it? It was the believing God when he engaged his Promise in the Covenant he made with him. The Faith which God counted to Abraham for Righteousness, was nothing but a firm Belief of what God declar'd to him, and a stedfast relying on him for the accomplishment of what he had promised. Abraham believ'd that tho' he and Sarah were old, and past the time and hopes of Children, yet he should have a Son by her, and by him become the Father of a great People which should possess the Land of Canaan. The thing promis'd to him was no more but a Son by his Wife Sarah, and a numerous Posterity by him which should possess the Land of Canaan. These were but temporal Blessings and (except the Birth of a Son) very remote, such as he should never live to see. But because he question'd not the performance of it, but rested fully satisfied in the Goodness, Truth, and Faithfulness of God who had promis'd, it was counted to him for Righteousness. The Faith whereby those Believers of old (i.e. before our Saviour's time) pleased God, was nothing but a stedfast reliance on the Goodness...
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and Faithfulness of God, for those good things which either the light of Nature or particular Promises had given them grounds to hope for. This was all that was require'd of them, to be persuaded of and embrace the Promises which they had. They could be persuaded of no more than was propos'd to them, embrace no more than was reveal'd. They had a Belief of the Messiah to come? they believ'd that God would, according to his Promise, in due time send the Messiah to be a King and Deliverer. All that was require'd before the Messiah's appearing in the World was, to believe what God had reveal'd, and to rely with a full Assurance on God for the performance of his Promise, and to believe that in due time he would send them the Messiah, this anointed King, this promised Saviour and Deliverer, according to his Word. Thus Mr. Lock p. 23, 24, 247, 249, 252, 253, 254. of his Reasonab. of Christianity.

Observations.

Here in Reasonab. of Christian. p. 23. Mr. Lock says, This Faith for which God justifi'd Abraham, as p. 24. he says Abraham was justifi'd for his Faith, and in like manner p. 22. God justifies a Man for believing: Now (as it was observ'd above, Chap. 19.) this is not the Scripture-Language, he constantly reads in his Bible Justified by Faith, not for it. It may therefore be justly wonder'd that Mr. Lock, who is so much for keeping close to the Expressions of his Bible, and thinks it our Duty to do it (see his Third Letter, p. 123. and 210.) should affect to say so often that God justifies for Faith. But perhaps he will correct it in his next Edition.

It is also just matter of Wonder, that he should say, that no more than temporal Blessings were propos'd to Abraham, and that the Faith which God counted
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counted to him for Righteousness was nothing but his believing those Promises, and resting fully satis-
ished of their Performance; (See Reasonab. of Chri-
Stian. p. 24. and 249.) especially when speaking of
those Believers of old mention'd Heb. 11. (of whom
Abraham is one) he says expressly, that they had a
Belief of the Messiah to come, and that they believ'd
that God would, according to his Promise, in due time
send the Messiah: see Ib. p. 253, 254. And he that
consults the New Testament, will find, that as to
the Promise of the Messiah, and the Belief of it,
there is more said of Abraham than of the rest.
Abraham saw Christ's day, and rejoyc'd, S. John 8. 56.
In thy Seed shall all the Kindreds of the earth be blef-
sed, Acts 3. 25. To Abraham were the Promises made,
and to his Seed, which is Christ, Gal. 3. 16.

C H A P. XXII.

Of our Faith under the Gospel.

The Belief of one invisible eternal omnipotent
God, Maker of Heaven and Earth, &c. was
requir'd before the Revelation of the Gospel as well as
now. The Gospel was writ to induce Men into a be-
lief of this Proposition, that Jesus of Nazareth was
the Messiah, which if they believ'd, they should have
Life. After his Death, his Resurrection was also
commonly requir'd to be believ'd as a necessary Article,
and sometimes solely insist'd on. Salvation or Perdi-
tion depends upon believing or rejecting this one Pro-
position, That Jesus was the Messiah. I mean, this
is all is requir'd to be believ'd by those who acknowledge but one eternal and invisible God, the Maker of
Heaven and Earth. For, that there is something more
requir'd to Salvation besides believing, we shall see
hereafter. All that was to be believ'd for Justifi-
G 3
cation was no more but this single Proposition, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ, or the Messiah. This, that Jesus was the Messiah, was all the Doctrine the Apostles propos’d to be believ’d. Above threescore years after our Saviour’s Passion, S. John knew nothing else requir’d to be believ’d for the attaining of life, but that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God. Whoever would believe him to be the Saviour promised, and take him now rais’d from the dead, and constituted the Lord and Judge of all Men, to be their King and Ruler, should be saved. Mr. Lock, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 25, 29, 31, 43, 47, 93, 194, 304. That this, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, is the sole Doctrine press’d and required to be believ’d in the whole Tenour of our Saviour’s and his Apostles preaching, we have shew’d through the whole History of the Evangelists and the Acts. And I challenge them to shew that there was any other Doctrine upon their Assent to which, or Disbelief of it, Men were pronounced Believers or Unbelievers, and accordingly receiv’d into the Church of Christ, or else kept out of it. Ibid. p. 195. Thus Mr. Lock.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. Lock challenges others to shew any other Doctrine, when he shews it himself. He says, that our Lord’s Resurrection was also commonly requir’d to be believ’d as a necessary Article, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 31. What can be more plain? So The Belief of one invisible, eternal, omnipotent God, Maker of Heaven and Earth, &c. is requir’d. Ibid. p. 25. We must believe him to have been rais’d from the dead, and constituted the Lord and Judge of all Men, and to be our King and Ruler; for if we do not believe these, how can we take him now rais’d from the dead, and constituted the Lord and Judge of all Men, to be our King and Ruler, which he expressly requires?
quires? Ibid. p. 304. He says, Ibid. p. 30, that we may gather what was to be believ'd by all Nations, from what was preached to them by the Apostles. Now he expressly tells us, that the Apostle S. Paul preached that Jesus being risen from the dead, now reigneth, and shall more publickly manifest his Kingdom in judging the world at the last day. Ibid. p. 191. In like manner, p. 190. We see what it was our Saviour preached to the Apostles, and what it was that was to be preached to all Nations; viz. That he was the Messiah that had suffer'd, and rose from the dead the third day, and fulfill'd all things that was written in the Old Testament concerning the Messiah; and that those who believ'd this and repented, should receive Remission of their Sins through this Faith in him. Here Mr. Lock plainly testifies, that beside this one Article, That Jesus is the Messiah, the Apostles preach'd, that he suffer'd, rose again, fulfill'd all things that were written in the Old Testament concerning him, that he now reigneth, shall judge the World at the last day, and that those that repent, and believe the Gospel, shall receive Remission of Sins. Is it not then matter of greatest Admiration, that the same Person should tell us that Salvation or Perdition depends upon believing or rejecting this one Proposition, that Jesus was the Messiah, Ibid. p. 43. that all that was to be believ'd for Justification, was no more but this single Proposition, p. 47. that this was all the Doctrine the Apostles propos'd to be believ'd, p. 93. that for threescore years after our Saviour's Passion, S. John knew nothing else requir'd to be believ'd for the attaining of Life but this, p. 194. and that this is the sole Doctrine requir'd to be believ'd, p. 195. especially when in his Vindication of his Reasonab. of Christian, p. 29. he seems to complain of those that blam'd him for contending for one Article? Having (says he) thus plainly mention'd more than one Article, I might have taken it
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it amiss, &c. And so in his Second Vindication, p. 26. he hath these words, That there is one God, and Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who rose again from the dead, ascended into Heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God, shall come to judge the quick and dead, are more than one Article, and may very properly be call'd These Articles. Now in the foregoing Page he refers us to places in his Reasonab. of Christianity where he makes the Belief of all these necessary, which (says he) is evidence enough that I contended not for one single Article, and no more. All that I can say is, that it is not easie to reconcile Mr. Locke to himself, or to make out that sundry Passages in his Reasonab. of Christianity do not clash with each other.

He says, in Reasonab. of Christianity. p. 31. that Christ's Resurrection was sometimes solely insisted on, and yet he will confess that we cannot thence conclude that to be the sole Article that is necessary to be believ'd. Why then doth he urge so much that this, that Jesus is the Christ, is the sole Doctrine, the only Article, that one Proposition, that is requir'd to be believ'd, because perhaps it is sometimes solely insisted on?

Mr. Locke, Ibid. p. 43. having said that S. Paul tells the Jews at Antioch, Acts 13. 46. It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you, but seeing you put it off from you, we turn to the Gentiles, adds, Here 'tis plain that S. Paul's charging their Blood upon their own heads, is, for opposing this single Truth, that Jesus was the Messiah, that Salvation or Perdition depends upon believing or rejecting this one Proposition: Thus Mr. Locke. But I would know how all this is plain from the Words which he allidges from Acts 13. 46. for 'tis certain that it is not said in express terms, either that the charging their Blood on their own Heads is for opposing this single Truth, that Jesus is the Messiah,
or that Salvation or Perdition depends upon believing or rejecting this one Proposition. It is true, when the Apostle says, *Te put it from you*, he intimates, that it was wholly their own fault that they did not receive Benefit by the Words being spoken to them, and that may look something toward the charging their Blood upon their own Heads; but as to all the rest, there is not the least ground or footstep of it, *Acts* 13. 46. Perhaps Mr. Lock will say, that by the Word of God there is meant no more than this one Proposition, That Jesus is the Messiah: But who will not rather believe, that when St. Paul said, *It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you*, he thereby meant that Word of God which he had preach’d to them of Antioch in Pisidia, (as is recorded in that Chapter,) and which the Jews contradicted. He had preached, That God had of the Seed of David, according to Promise, raised up to Israel a Saviour Jesus, v. 23. That the Jews at Jerusalem had condemn’d him, and desir’d Pilate to put him to Death, and in so doing, fulfill’d the Voices of the Prophets, and the things that were written concerning him, v. 27, 28, 29. that he was also buried, and that God rais’d him from the dead no more to see Corruption, according to the Prophecies of him, and that he was seen for many Days after his Resurrection, v. 29, 30, 31. *usque ad 38*. and that every one that believes should receive Remission of Sins by him, and be justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the Law of Moses, v. 38, 39. All these are more than one single Truth, or one Proposition, and are all comprehended under the Word of God, mention’d, v. 46. And it may be observ’d, that in all that Sermon, from the beginning of v. 16. to v. 42. there is not express mention as much as once made of Jesus’s being the Messiah, or King, tho’ there is of his being a Justifier and Saviour.
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In his Reasonab. of Christian. p. 47. Mr. Lock hath these Words, So that all that was to be believ'd for Justification, was no more but this single Proposition, That Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. The Words, So that, import, that he deduceth this from one or more of the Texts of Scripture which he there alleages, and, if I mistake not, from the last of them, viz. Acts 10. 43. where 'tis said, To him (i.e. Jesus of Nazareth) give all the Prophets witness, that through his Name whosoever believeth in him shall receive Remission of Sins. Here indeed is mention of Remission of Sins, or Justification; but that all that was to be believ'd for Justification, was that single Proposition which he so often mentions, will never be prov'd from that Text. Yea, Mr. Lock, speaking of St. Peter's Sermon to Cornelius, Acts 10. (of which that Text is a part) doth not say that there is in it any express mention of our Saviour's being the Messiah, but (says he) he is described to be so by his Miracles, Death, Resurrection, Dominion, and coming to judge the quick and the dead. See him in his Second Vindication, p. 307.

In his Reasonab. of Christian. p. 93. he alleages the Words of Acts 8. 4. They that were scattered abroad, went everywhere preaching the Word. Which Word was nothing (says he) but this, that Jesus was the Messiah: But if you ask how he proves this, he only says, As we have found by examining what they preach'd all through their History. Where, by their History, he means, undoubtedly, the History of the Apostles; and when he says, they preach'd, that they must be the Apostles, whereas they that are said to have preach'd the Word, Acts 8. 4. were not the Apostles; for we are told, v. 1. that the Apostles were not scatter'd abroad as thofe were that are mention'd, v. 4. But to wave this: Whereas Mr. Lock so often faith, that by examining what the Apostles preach'd
preach’d all through their History, he had found, that the Word, preach’d by them was nothing but this, that *Jesus was the Messiah*, I have just now shew’d, that it is easie for any one to find the contrary, by examining only that part of the History of the Apostles, which we have, Acts 10. from v. 34. to v. 44. and Acts 13. from v. 23. to v. 42. where, by Mr. Lock’s own Confession, they treated of the Miracles, Death, Resurrection, and Dominion of our Saviour, and of his coming to judge the World, as also of Remission of Sins by him. See him in Reasonab. of Christian, p. 41. and Second Vindication, p. 307.

In his Reasonab. of Christian, p. 194. Mr. Lock says, *Above three score Years after our Saviour’s Passion*, St. John knew nothing else required to be believe’d, for the attaining of Life, but that *Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God*. But will he hold to this, that St. John knew nothing else required to be believe’d, and admit of no Limitation, or Exception? Did he not know that it was necessary to believe One *Only True God*? St. John 17. 3. Did he not know that it was necessary to believe, that God rais’d the Lord Jesus from the dead? But what shall we say to the Words of St. John 20. 31. which Mr. Lock alledges, Ibid. p. 193. and from which he infers this, *These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God; and that believing, ye may have Life in his Name*? I answer, That it may be said, 1. That here it is as much required, that we believe Jesus to be the Son of God, as ’tis to believe him to be the Messiah. 2. That these, that *Jesus is the Messiah*, and that *he is the Son of God*, are two principal Articles, and therefore mention’d by St. John; but he does not say, *These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and only this; neither does he say, And that believing this alone, ye may have Life:* But, *And that believing*
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lieving in general, i.e. believing all that the Holy Ghost makes necessary to be believ'd. If thou believe in thine Heart, that God rais'd the Lord Jesus from the dead, thou shalt be saved, Rom. 10. 9. Because in these Words our Lord's Resurrection is soley insisted on, Mr. Locke will not conclude, that St. Paul knew nothing else requir'd to be believed for attaining Life but that: And then why should he conclude, concerning St. John, that he knew nothing else requir'd to be believ'd but these two Articles, that Jesus is the Messiah, and that he is the Son of God, because St. John 20. 31. he mentions only these? I know that Mr. Locke does not allow us to call them two Articles; but I am so little moved with his saying (and not proving) that Messiah and the Son of God are two Expressions signifying one and the same thing, that I make bold to do it without his Licence.

Mr. Locke, perhaps, will think that I neglect him, if I do not take notice of his Chronology. He says, That above three-score Years after our Saviour's Passion, St. John knew nothing else required to be believ'd. His Reason is, Because St. John's Gospel was written so long after, as (says he) both Epiphanius and St. Jerom assure us. I shall grant, that St. John's Gospel might, perhaps, be writ so long after our Lord's Crucifixion; for St. Hierom, in Catalogo, and in Lib. 1. con. Jovinian, says, That Ecclesiastical History makes St. John to have liv'd three-score and eight Years after the Lord's Passion. But I cannot but take notice of Mr. Locke's Caution (some may call it his Prudence) in not referring us to the Places where Epiphanius, and St. Hierom, assure us, that it was writ so late. As to Epiphanius, it is true, that in Hares. 51. he says, that St. John writ his Gospel after the ninetieth Year of his Age; and if he had also told us how old St. John was at the time when our Saviour was crucified, we might have
have known whether, according to Epiphanius, St. John writ his Gospel above three score Years after our Lord's Passion; but I do not remember that Epiphanius hath any where told us St. John's Age at the time of our Saviour's Suffering. And as to St. Hierom, I have not found that he doth acquaint us, either in what Year of his own Age, or how long after his Lord's Passion it was that St. John writ his Gospel.

C H A P. XXIII.

Of Saving Faith and Unbelief.

They that believe Jesus to be the Messiah, their King, but will not obey his Laws, and will not have him to rule over them; they are but greater Rebels, and God will not justify them for a Faith, which doth but increase their Guilt, and oppose diametrically the Kingdom and Design of the Messiah, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all Iniquity, and purifie to himself a peculiar People, zealous of good Works, Tit. 2. 14. And therefore St. Paul tells the Galatians, That that which availeth is Faith; but Faith working by Love, and that Faith without Works, i.e. the Works of sincere Obedience to the Law and Will of Christ, is not sufficient for our Justification, St. James shews at large, Chap. 2. Only those who believe Jesus to be the Messiah, and take him to be their King, with a sincere Endeavour after Righteousness, in obeying his Law, shall have their past Sins not imputed to them, and shall have that Faith taken instead of Obedience.

Mr. Lock's Reasonab. of Christian. p. 213, 214, 215. None are sentenced or punish'd for Unbelief, but only for their Misdeeds. They are Workers of Iniquity on whom the Sentence is pronounced. Every where the
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the Sentence follows doing or not doing, without any mention of believing or not believing: Not that any, to whom the Gospel hath been preach’d, shall be save’d, without believing Jesus to be the Messiah; for all being Sinners, and Transgressors of the Law, and so unjust, are all liable to Condemnation, unless they believe, and so through Grace are justified by God for this Faith, which shall be accounted to them for Righteousness. But the rest wanting this Cover, this Allowance for their Transgressions, must answer for all their Actions, and being found Transgressors of the Law, shall, by the Letter and Sanction of the Law, be condemned for not having paid a full Obedience to that Law; and not for want of Faith: That is, not the Guilt on which the Punishment is laid, tho’ it be the want of Faith which lays open their Guilt uncover’d, and exposes them to the Sentence of the Law against all that are unrighteous. Ibid. p. 243, 245, 246. Thus Mr. Lock.

Observations.

Of the Expression, Justified for Faith, whereas the Scripture-Language is Justified by Faith, I took notice before Chap. 19. and 21.

Here I cannot but observe how apt Men are to run into Extremes. There are some that say that Unbelief is the only Sin for which Men shall be condemn’d; they shall be condemn’d not for their other Sins, but, solely, for this. Mr. Lock, on the other hand, would persuade us, that Men shall not be condemned at all for Unbelief: The Sentence (says he) follows not doing, without any mention of not believing. He alledges for this, St. John 5. 28, 29. St. Matth. 7. 22, 23. 13. 14, 49. 16. 24. 25. 24, &c. St. Luke 13. 26. But, 1. In many of these Places, as St. John 5. 28, 29. St. Matth. 13. 41. (not 14, as it is in Mr. Lock,) and 49. St. Matth. 16. 27. (not
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24. as Mr. Lock,) there is not the least mention of any Sentence, therefore it is manifest that they do not tell us for what Men shall be sentenced. 2. Those who are mention'd, St. Matth. 7. 22, 23. and St. Luke 13. 26, 27. were Believers, and so could not be sentenced for Unbelief. I do not say, that they believ'd to the saving of their Souls, or with a saving Faith, a Faith working by Love, and bringing forth the Fruits of good Works; for the contrary is most manifest, they were Workers of Iniquity, or Unrighteousness: But I say, that they were Believers, they should say unto Christ, Lord, Lord; yea, they were such Believers as not only own'd him for their Lord, but also prophesied, cast out Devils, and did many mighty Works in his Name; and therefore, if they were not sentenced for Unbelief, but only for their Misdeeds, it cannot be thought strange. 3. Let it be supposed that they were Unbelievers, all that these Texts say, is, that Workers of Iniquity shall hear that Sentence, I tell you, I know you not, depart from me. And if it may be hence inferred, that they are to be condemned only for working Iniquity, then from St. Mark 16. 16. where it is said, He that believes not, shall be damned, it may be concluded that he shall be condemned only for Unbelief; that the Sentence shall follow not believing, without any mention of not doing. But this Inference Mr. Lock will not allow. They are Workers of Iniquity, on whom the Sentence is pronounced, says Mr. Lock, out of St. Matth. 7. 23. They are Unbelievers who shall be condemned, say I, out of St. Mark 16. 16. And if from St. Mark 16. Mr. Lock will not conclude that Men shall be condemned only for Unbelief, and not for working Iniquity, why does he conclude from St. Matth. 7. that they shall be condemned only for working Iniquity, and not for Unbelief? 4. As to St. Matth. 25. 24, &c. which may seem to be more to Mr. Lock's Purpose.
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Purpose than the former; for this tells us expressly for what Men shall be sentenced to Punishment, which the other do not, (the Judge shall say to those on his Left Hand, Depart from me, ye cursed; for I was hungry, and ye gave me not to eat, &c.) it is enough to say, That if, because the Sentence of extreme Malevolence shall be pronounced upon Men, because they did not feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, take in the Strangers, cloath the naked, visit the sick and imprison'd, he can infer, that Men shall be condemn'd only for their not having done these things, and not for their Unbelief; then certainly, because St. John 3. 18. it is said, He that believeth not, is now condemned, because he hath not believ'd in the Name of the only begotten Son of God, we may infer, that Men are and shall be condemn'd only for their not believing, and not for their not doing. If Men shall be condemn'd only for the Sins mention'd St. Matth. 25. then they must be condemn'd only for Sins of Uncharitableness. Impenitence is not expressly mention'd in these Places of Scripture, produced by Mr. Lock, any more than Unbelief. Will he say, that Men shall not be condemn'd for their Impenitence? The Truth is, that he may with as much Reason say That, as say that the Sentence shall not be pronounced on them for their Infidelity. Why should Mr. Lock think it strange that Men should be condemn'd for not paying Obedience to the Command of Christ, who hath commanded all Men everywhere to believe and repent? Unbelief is a Sin which is the Cause of all our other Sins, which would be prevented, if we did unfeignedly, and with a lively Faith, believe the Gospel: It is also that which, as it were, binds and fastens the Guilt of our other Sins upon us; they will not be forgiven, unless we believe and repent: And yet, according to Mr. Lock, Men shall be condemn'd for their other Sins, and not for this. I have,
I have perhaps dwelt too long upon this, yet I think it not amiss to give a brief Account why I render St. John 3. 18. *He that believeth not is now condemned*, whereas in our Translation it is, *He that believeth not is condemned already.* The Words are *in verbo*, is now condemned, or is now judged, as most worthy of Condemnation. Now that God hath express'd such wonderful Love to the World, by sending his only begotten Son into it, not to condemn it, but that by him the World might be saved, (see v. 16, 17.) and now that he is come into the World, and hath wrought such Miracles, he that believes not must be most justly worthy of Condemnation, because he believes not in the Name of the only begotten Son of God, being given, that every one that believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting Life. Now that Light is come into the World, if Men will not believe in the Light, every one will judge that they are justly worthy of Condemnation, as our Saviour says in the very next Words, v. 19. *This is the Condemnation, (i.e. that which chiefly deserves Condemnation,) that Light hath come into the World, and Men have loved Darkness more than the Light.* If this Rendring and Exposition of the Words be receiv'd, Commentators will not need to trouble themselves so much as they have done, with enquiring in what Sense the Unbeliever is said to be already condemned, since this which I offer is a plain and easie Interpretation, *He that believes not, is now condemned,* (now, after the Son of God's being actually come into the World, after Miracles wrought, and the Gospel preach'd by him,) because he believes not in the Name of the only begotten Son of God. This Text then plainly shews the Danger and Defert of not believing, and therefore it concerns us to beware, lest as the Israelites, of whom the Apostle speaks Heb. 4. did not enter into the promised Land, by reason of Unbelief, v. 6.
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so we be excluded the Heavenly Canaan for our Unbelief, v. vi.

C H A P. XXIV.

Of Repentance, Baptism, and Remission of Sins.

Repentance is as absolute a Condition of the Covenant of Grace as Faith, and as necessary to be perform'd as that. This was not only the beginning of our Saviour's preaching, but the Summ of all that he did preach, viz. That Men should repent and believe the good Tidings which he brought them. Believing Jesus to be the Messiah, and repenting, were so necessary and fundamental Parts of the Covenant of Grace, that one of them alone is often put for both. Repentance is not only a Sorrow for Sins past, but (what is a natural Consequence of that Sorrow, if it be real,) a turning from them into a new and contrary Life. It is an hearty Sorrow for our past Misdeeds, and a sincere Resolution and Endeavour, to the utmost of our Power, to conform all our Actions to the Law of God. It does not consist in one single Act of Sorrow, (that being the first and leading Act, gives Denomination to the whole,) but in doing Works meet for Repentance, in a Sincere Obedience to the Law of Christ, the remainder of our Lives. It is in other Words well express'd by newness of Life. And sometimes turning about is put alone to signify Repentance. Mr. Lock, Reason of Christianity, p. 197, 198, 200, 201. To be baptized into his Name is to enroll our selves into the Kingdom of Jesus the Messiah, and profess ourselves his Subjects. By Baptism we are made Denizens, and solemnly incorporated into that Kingdom, ibid., p. 212,
Observations.

Believing Jesus to be the Messiah, and Repenting,
are so necessary and fundamental Parts of the Covenant
of Grace, that one of them alone is often put
for both; so Mr. Lock, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 198.
But I would know why they are the more necessary
and fundamental Parts of the Covenant of Grace,
on this account, that one of them alone is oft put
for both, or how this, that one of them alone is oft
put for both, doth prove that they are necessary and fundamental Parts of it. Withal, how appears it, that one of them alone is oft put for both? All the Proof that he tenders for it is in the Words immediately following: For (says he) St. Mark, chap. 6. 12. mentions nothing but their preaching Repentance, as St. Luke in the parallel Place, chap. 9. 6. mentions nothing but their evangelizing or preaching the good News of the Kingdom of the Messiah. Thus Mr. Lock. But how will he hence make good this Inference, Therefore, of these two, Believing and Repenting, one alone is oft put for both? There is no mention of believing in either Place: St. Luke says, that the Apostles preach’d the Gospel; St. Mark says, that they preach’d, that Men should repent; of believing here is not a Word. But from both Texts we may gather that this, That Jesus is the Messiah, was not the only Article which the Apostles preach’d: For in St. Mark 6. 12. they preach’d, that Men should repent, or that they should have their Sins remitted upon their Repentance, as St. Peter afterward preach’d, Repent, and be baptiz’d for the Remission of Sins, Acts 2. 38. and, as our Saviour says, St. Luke 24. 47. that Repentance and Remission of Sins should be preach’d; so that it is clear, that the Apostles preach’d this Article of Remission of Sins upon our repenting. And then, in St. Luke 9. 6. they preach’d the Gospel, which comprehends more than that one Article, That Jesus is the Messiah, as the good News, that a Saviour was born into the World, &c.

Mr. Lock, in Reasonab. of Christianity, p. 201, having said, that sometimes turning about is put alone to signify Repentance, cites St. Matth. 13. 19. and St. Luke 22. 32. where the Word is Eροτησθαι, and why that should be rendred to turn about, rather than to convert or turn, I am to be taught.

Ibid.
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Ibid. p. 212. he says, That to be baptiz\'d into the Name of Christ, is to enroll our selves in the Kingdom of Jesus the Messiah. But as we are said to be baptiz\'d in or into the Name of the Lord Jesus, so we are also said to be baptiz\'d in or into the Name of the Father; and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, St. Matth. 28. 19. Now to be baptiz\'d in the Name of the Holy Ghost, cannot signify the enrolling our selves in the Kingdom of the Holy Ghost; for we do not read in Holy Writ of the Kingdom of the Holy Ghost, as we do of the Kingdom of the dear Son of God: And why then should we make In or into the Name to signify one thing when it is spoken of the Son, and another when it is spoken of the Holy Ghost, or of the whole blessed and glorious Trinity? As then to baptize in or into the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is to baptize, 1. by Authority and Commission from them; 2. into the Worship and faithful Service of them all the Days of our Life: So I conceive we are to interpret the being baptiz\'d in or into the Name of the Lord Jesus.

Ibid. p. 241. Mr. Lock says, In consideration of Men becoming Christ\'s Subjects by Faith in him, whereby they believe and take him to be the Messiah, their former Sins shall be forgiven. But other where he makes Men become the Subjects of Christ by Baptism as well as by Faith, and both Repentance and Baptism to be required for the Remission of Sins, (alluding Acts 2. 38.) and not Faith only. And therefore he might have express\'d the Gospel-Terms, or the Conditions of Forgiveness, more fully, by saying, that if Men repent, and believe the Gospel, and be baptized, they shall, through the Merits and Death of their blessed Saviour, have their former Sins forgiven.
Of the Immortality of the Soul, and the Signification of the Word Spirit.

If that will not serve his turn, I will tell him a Principle of mine that will clear the Soul's Immortality to him, and that is the Revelation of Life and Immortality by Jesus Christ, through the Gospel. Mr. Lock, Answer to Remarks, p. 5, 6. Perhaps my using the Word Spirit for a thinking Substance, without excluding Materiality out of it, will be thought too great a Liberty; but the most enlightened of all the ancient People of God, Solomon himself, speaks after the same manner. Nor did the way of speaking in our Saviour's time vary from this. I would not be thought hereby to say, That Spirit does never signify a purely immaterial Substance: In that Sense the Scripture, I take it, speaks, when it says God is a Spirit; and in that Sense I have proved, from my Principles, That there is a Spiritual Substance, and am certain that there is a Spiritual Immaterial Substance. The First Letter, p. 68, 71, 72, 73.

Observations.

Mr. Lock, in his Answer to Remarks, p. 5, hath these Words, I suppose this Author, (i.e. the Author of the Remarks) will not question the Soul's Immateriality to be a Proof of its Immortality: But he not then, by taking so much Pains to persuade us that its Immateriality cannot be demonstratively prov'd, manifestly weaken one Proof of its Immortality? Mr. Lock, in Essay, 1. 4. c. 3. §. 6. says, That he would not any way lessen the Belief of the Soul's Immateriality: But he cannot expect that we should
Should believe Words against the Evidence of Deeds. Yet, in his Essay, l. 2. c. 23. §. 18. he hath let fall some Words, from which I think the Soul’s Immateriality may be prov’d: The Ideas we have belonging and peculiar to Spirit, are Thinking and Will. Thus Mr. Lock. Now (say I) if Thinking and Willing are peculiar to Spirit, then the Soul which thinks and wills is a Spirit. And that by Spirit he in that Chapter means an immaterial Substance, is evident, for he opposeth Spirit to material Substance. Besides the complex Ideas we have of material sensible Substances, we are able to frame the complex Idea of a Spirit. So Mr. Lock, §. 15. And so what he in the very next Sentence calls immaterial Substances, in his Margin he calls spiritual Substances. If then Thinking and Willing are peculiar to Spirit, the Soul which thinks and wills is a Spirit, or spiritual immaterial Substance.

I cannot reconcile the Immortality of the Soul with Mens ceasing to be when they die. Mr. Lock, who useth that Expression of ceasing to be, more than once, (see above, Chap. 15.) must invent some unknown Sense of it, which may reconcile them.

I shew’d, just now, That Mr. Lock, in Essay, l. 2. c. 23. did by Spirit understand an immaterial Substance; and indeed he doth own that he doth so, in his Third Letter, p. 430. I shall transcribe his Words at large: From the Ideas of Thought, (says he,) and a Power of moving of Matter, which we experience in our selves, there was no more difficulty to conclude there was an immaterial Substance in us, than that we had material Parts. These Ideas of Thinking and Power, of moving of Matter, I in another Place shew’d, did demonstratively lead us to the certain Knowledge of the Existence of an immaterial Thinking Being, in whom we have the Idea of Spirit in the strictest Sense, in which Sense I also apply’d it to the Soul, in that 23d. Chapter. Thus Mr. Lock, and...
And yet, in his First Letter, p. 68. he tells us of his using the Word Spirit (not in that which he calls the strictest Sense, but) for a thinking Substance, without excluding Materiality out of it. He sets himself alfo to defend his using it thus.

This he doth, first, by the Authority of Cicero and Virgil, (Ibid. p. 69, 70.) who (as he says) call the Soul Spiritus, and yet do not deny it to be a subtle Matter. But supposing this which he says, to be true, we may return Anifier in his own Words, in his Third Letter, p. 126. That Latin Sentence, Nil tam certum est quam quod de dubio certum, being objected, he taking it to be a Saying of the Romans, answers thus, As I take it, they (i.e. the Romans) never use the English Word Certainty; and tho' it be true, that the English Word Certainty, be taken from the Latin Word Certus; yet that therefor Certainty in English is us'd exactly in the same Sense that Certus is in Latin, that I think you will not say. The very same say I, As I take it, Cicero and Virgil never us'd the English Word Spirit; and tho' our Word Spirit be from the Latin Spiritus, yet that therefore Spirit in English, is us'd exactly in the same Sense that Spiritus is in Latin. Mr. Lock I think will not say. If he thought this a sufficient Answer to others, why should it not be a sufficient Answer to him?

But farther, Mr. Lock having said in his First Letter, p. 69. that both Cicero and Virgil call the Soul Spiritus, in answer hereto it was suggested concerning Cicero, That in his Tusculan Questions, in the Entrance of the Dispute about the Soul, he takes Animus for the Soul, and neither Anima nor Spiritus; and that Spiritus is taken by him for Breath. Now if this be true, that is not which Mr. Lock says, that Cicero calls the Soul Spiritus. What says he in his Third Letter to this? Not a Word, nor doth he take the least notice of it, neither
neither doth he in that long Reply in his Third Letter, p. 431, &c. produce one place out of Cicero, wherein he useth Spiritus for the Soul. If it be said that he had done that in his First Letter, I answer, that he there cites only one place, where he takes the Words on trust, and lets them down thus: Vita continetur corpore & spiritu; see him, p. 70. But if he had consulted Cicero himself, he would have found (in Orat. pro Marcello, vers. fin.) the Words to be these: Nec hac tua vita dicenda est, quae corpore & spiritu continetur, illa, inquam, illa vita est tua Cesar, quae vigebit memoro. Seculorum omnium, quam posteritas alet, quam ipsa aeternitas semper intuebitur. Let Mr. Lock himself now judge whether Spiritus here must be necessarily understood to signify the Soul, and whether it can be more fitly interpreted than in the Sense in which Cicero most constantly useth it, as signifying Breath, even the Breath of our Nostrils, without which the Body cannot live, and which is so necessary to preserve this mortal Life, which the Orator tells Cesar was not his Life.

As to Virgil, Mr. Lock only cites these Words out of him, Dum Spiritus hos regit artus, saying, that he speaks of the Soul; see his First Letter, p. 70. In answer to this, he was told, that Spiritus is there taken for the Vital Spirit; and that Virgil did believe the Soul to be more than a mere Vital Spirit, and that it subsisted and acted in a separate State: To all which, Mr. Lock, in his Reply in his Third Letter, p. 440, 441. says nothing at all, nor does he take the least notice of it.

But Mr. Lock, to justify his using the Word Spirit in such a Signification, alludes the Authority of one greater than Cicero or Virgil, or the most enlightened Person of the Heathen World, viz. Solomon himself, Eccles. 3. 19, 21. That which befalleth the Sons of Men befalleth Beasts, even one thing befalleth them,
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them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one Spirit. Who knoweth the Spirit of a Man that goeth upward, and the Spirit of a Beast that goeth down to the Earth. See Mr. Lock's First Letter, p. 71. To which I answer, 1. How appears it that these are Solomon's Words, and not the Sayings of others, which Solomon only repeats? Is it probable that Solomon would affirm absolutely, as his own Sense, that Man hath no Pre-eminence above a Beast? Which Words we have, v. 19. tho' they are omitted by Mr. Lock. If they be not Solomon's Words, then it is clear that he hath not the Authority of Solomon; yea, then he hath not the Authority of our Translators, who (this being supposed) applied not the Word Spirit to Beasts; but they, whose Words the Preacher repeats, apply'd the Word הרוח to them, which Word our Translators render Breath, v. 19. and Spirit, v. 21. 2. But let it be supposed (tho' not granted) that they are Solomon's Words and Sense, I need only borrow once more Mr. Lock's Words: As I take it, Solomon never us'd the English Word Spirit; and tho' it be true that the Hebrew Word הרוח is often render'd Spirit, yet that therefore Spirit in English hath exactly the same Signification that הרוח hath in Hebrew, I think Mr. Lock will not say; for then Spirit must signify the Wind, Breath, &c. since הרוח is apply'd to these. In vain therefore doth he pretend that he hath the Authority of Solomon.

And yet he seeks to justify his use of the Word also by the Authority of one greater than Solomon. When our Saviour (says he) after his Resurrection stood in the midst of them, they were affrighted, and suppos'd that they had seen מSpirit, S. Luke 24. 37. But our Saviour says to them, v. 39. Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I my self, handle me and see, for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have. See Ms. Lock, First Letter, p. 71, 72. who forgot
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forgot to tell us who the They and Them are; but they are the Apostles: and from our Saviour's words to them he here argues. And if he would argue directly, he must do it in this or the like form: If our Saviour say that a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones, then he useth the word Spirit as signifying something from which Matter is not excluded. But Mr. Lock must have invented a new Logick before he could have made good this Consequence: He therefore goes another way to work both in his First and in his Third Letter. I shall briefly examine what he says in both.

In his First Letter, p. 72. he says, that these words of our Saviour's put the same distinction between Body and Spirit that Ciceron did in the place above cited, viz. That the one was a gross Compaages that could be felt and handled, and the other such as Virgil describes the Ghost or Soul of Anchises:

Ter conatus ibi colo dare braclia circum,
Ter frustra comprensâ manus effugit imago,
Par levibus ventis, volucrîq, simulîma somnâ.

Thus Mr. Lock. So that in short, according to him, in those words of our Saviour an Image is call'd a Spirit. And can we not conceive an Image that doth not include Matter? I may instance in those Ideas or Images which are the immediate Objects of Mr. Lock's Mind in thinking, are they material? Likewise in the Images that we see in our Dreams, which latter Instance I the rather mention, because Virgil, in these very Verses, compares the Image of which he speaks to Sleep, or to an Image appearing in Sleep, (formam apparentem in somnis) as some interpret it.

In his Third Letter, p. 444, he says, that from these words of our Saviour, a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones, it follows, that in Apparitions there is something that appears, and that that which appears
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is not wholly immaterial: Thus Mr. Lock. In Answer to it, I shall remind him, that in his Second Vindication of the Reasonab. of Christian. p. 228. he mentions a Request which Mr. Chillingworth puts up to Mr. Knot, and I think it no less necessary to be put up to him: Sir, I beseech you, when you write again, do us the favour to write nothing but Syllogisms: for I find it an extreme trouble to find out the concealed Propositions which are to connote the parts of your Enthymems. As now, for example, I profess to you, that I have done my best endeavour to find some Glue, or Sodder, or Cement, or Thread, or anything, to tie the Antecedent and this Consequent together. Thus Mr. Chillingworth. Here Mr. Lock's Enthymem is this, A Spirit hath not flesh and bones, ergo, In Apparitions there is something that appears, and that which appears is not wholly immaterial. If Mr. Lock can find some Glue or Sodder to join the Antecedent and this Consequent together, it is well: but if he cannot, I shall make bold to add, that nobody else can. Neither can he evade by saying that it was not from those words only, (viz. A Spirit hath not flesh and bones,) but from the whole Text S. Luke 24. 37, 39. that he draws that Consequence, that what appears is not wholly immaterial; for the case is the same. This may suffice as to his Authorities, which are found to do him no service at all.

He subjoins in his First Letter, p. 72, 73. I would not be thought hereby to say that Spirit never signifies a purely immaterial Substance. In that Sense the Scripture, I take it, speaks, when it says God is a Spirit; and in that Sense I have used it, and in that Sense I have pro'd, from my Principles, that there is a Spiritual Substance, and am certain that there is a Spiritual immaterial Substance. Thus Mr. Lock. But might he not have left out those words I take it, and affirm'd positively that when the Scripture says God is a Spirit, the word Spirit signifies a pure-
ly immaterial Substance? He tells that he is certain that there is a spiritual immaterial Substance, and therefore hope that he is certain that God is such: and if it be a certain Truth that God is a spiritual immaterial Substance, in what sense can the Scripture be judged to say that he is a Spirit but in this? God is a Spirit, and the Worshipers of him ought to worship in Spirit, S. John 4. 24. i.e. with their Minds (or, with application of Mind, as Mr. Locke interprets it in his Reasonab. of Christ, p. 286.) which Minds are likewise spiritual immaterial Substances.

C H A P. XXVI.

Of Conscience, Consideration, and Freedom.

Conscience is nothing else but our own Opinion of our own Actions, Mr. Locke, Essay, l. 1. c. 3. $ 8. 'Tis a Mistake, to think that Men cannot change the displeasingness or Indifference that is in Actions into Pleasure and Desire, if they will do but what is in their Power. A due Consideration will do it in some cases. Any Action is render'd more or less pleasing only by the contemplation of the End, and the being more or less persuaded of its tendency to it, or necessary connexion with it. This is certain, that Morality, establish'd upon its true Foundations, cannot but determine the choice in any one that will but consider; and he that will not be so much a rational Creature as to reflect seriously upon infinite Happiness and Misery, must needs condemn himself, as not making that use of his Understanding he should. Ibid. l. 2. c. 21. § 69, 70. By a due Consideration, and examining any Good propos'd, it is in our power to raise our Desires in a due proportion to the value of that Good, whereby it may come to work upon the Will, and be persuaded. The Mind having in most cases, as is evident
dent in Experience, a Power to suspend the Execution
and Satisfaction of any of its Desires; and so all, one
after another, is at liberty to consider the Objects of
them, examine them on all sides, and weigh them with
others. In this lies the Liberty Man has, and from
the not using it right comes all that variety of Mis-
takes, Errors, and Faults, we run into in the Con-
duct of our Lives, and our Endeavours after Happi-
ness; whilst we precipitate the Determination of our
Wills, and engage too soon before Examination. Were
we determined by any thing but the last Results of our
Minds, judging of the Good or Evil of any Action, we
were not free. If we look upon those superior Be-
ings above us, who enjoy perfect Happiness, we shall
have reason to judge they are more steadily determin'd
in their choice of Good than we; and yet we have no
reason to think they are less happy or less free than
we are. Even the Freedom of the Almighty hinder'd
not his being determin'd by what is best. The constant
desire of Happiness, and the constraint it puts upon
us to act for it, no body I think accounts an Abridg-
ment of Liberty, or at least an Abridgment of Liberty
to be complaint of. The suspending any particular
Desire, and keeping it from determining the Will,
and engaging us in Action, is standing still, where
we are not sufficiently advance'd of the way; Examina-
tion is the consulting a Guide; the Determination of
the Will upon Enquiry is following the direction of
that Guide; and he that hath a power to act or not
to act according as such Determination directs, is a
free Agent; such Determination abridges not that
Power wherein Liberty consists. The Care of our
selves, that we mistake not imaginary for real Happi-
ness, is the necessary Foundation of our Liberty,
and the stranger Ties we have to an unalterable Per-
fect of Happiness in general, which is our greatest
Good; and which, as such, our Desires always follow,
the more are we free from any necessary Determina-
tion
tion of our Will to any particular Action, or from a necessary Compliance with our Desire set upon any particular and then appearing greater Good, till we have duey examin'd whether it has a tendency to, or be inconsistent with our real Happiness. Let not any one say that he cannot govern his Passions, nor hinder them from breaking out and carrying him into Action; for, what he can do before a Prince, or a great Man, he can do alone, or in the presence of God, if he will. Ibid. § 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53. God having reveal'd that there shall be a Day of Judgment, I think that Foundation enough to conclude Men are free enough to be made answerable for their Actions, and to receive according to what they have done. The Third Letter, p. 444. Thus Mr. Lock.

OBSERVATIONS.

When Mr. Lock writ his Essay, he had not tied himself so strictly to use the Scripture-Language in speaking of matters of Religion, as he had when he writ his Third Letter. This appears, as from other Instances, so from his Definition or Description of Conscience. If he had been so much for the using Scripture-Language then as he was afterward, he would not have describ'd Conscience to be nothing else but our own Opinion of our own Actions. He had spoke more consonantly to Scripture-Language, if he had put the Word Knowledge, or Testimony, or Judgment instead of Opinion. For, according to Scripture, Conscience is that within us which knows, and also witnesses, and judges of our Actions, Conversations, &c. as it also judges of the Actions and Conversations of others.

1. Knowledge is in Scripture attributed to the Heart, or Conscience. Thus Eccles. 7: 23. Thine own Heart knows, that thou thy self hast curst others. The Vulgate reads, Thy Conscience knows, &c. Heart
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is frequently put for Conscience; see 1 Sam. 24. 5, and 2 Sam. 24. 10. and 1 Job. 3. 19, 20, 21, &c. The Hebrew Word which both the Seventy and also our Translation in the Margin renders Conscience, Eccles. 10. 20. viz. יד denotes Knowledge, as יד denotes the Word which the Chaldee Paraphrast there useth also doth, they both coming from יד, Curse not the King, no not in thy thought: so our Translation hath it in the Text; but in the Margin, instead of Thy Thought we have Thy Conscience; and so the Meaning is, Curse not the King, though thou do it so secretly that none but thine own Heart or Conscience can know it. And it is observable, that Gen. 43. 22. where Joseph's Brethren say We know not who put our money in our sacks, instead of יד We know not, the Vulgar hath Non est in nostra Conscientia.

2. Conscience is frequently said in Scripture to bear witness; My Conscience bearing me witness, so the Apostle Rom. 9. 1. who also, 2 Cor. 1. 12. speaks of the Testimony of his Conscience; and Rom. 2. 15. says of the Heathens, that their Conscience did bear witness.

3. Judging is also attributed to the Heart or Conscience in Scripture. Thus 1 John 3. 20. If our Heart (i.e. our Conscience) condemn us: and so again, If our Heart (or Conscience) condemn us not. So S. Paul, 1 Cor. 8. 7. Some with Conscience of an Idol to this hour eat of somewhat as offered to an Idol. With Conscience of an Idol, i.e. their Conscience judging that an Idol was something. And so S. Peter, If a man for Conscience toward God endure grief; 1 Pet. 2. 19. For Conscience toward God, i.e. because his Conscience judgeth that he ought to obey God.

Thus we read of Conscience its knowing, witnessing, and judging; but where will Mr. Locke find any thing that favours his Description, viz. that it is nothing else but our Opinion, &c.? In his Essay, l. 4. c. 15. §. 3. he makes Opinion to be the receiving a Pro-
a Proposition for true, without certain Knowledge that it is so: But Conscience both knows, (as we have seen,) and also certainly knows. There is one indeed that is greater than our Consciences, and knows all things, and with such Certainty as that nothing can compare with him: But that transcendent Certainty of the Divine Knowledge being excepted, there is no Knowledge that can pretend to greater and more absolute Certainty than that of Conscience. And therefore, even according to Mr. Locke, it is impossible that Conscience should be an Opinion.

But this is not the only Fault in Mr. Locke's Description of Conscience: It is (says he) our own Opinion of our own Actions; as if Mens Consciences had to do only with Actions, yea, only with our own Actions. But Conscience will not have its Authority or Jurisdiction confined within so narrow Limits: It will sit as Judge, not only upon Mens Actions, but also upon their Speeches, yea, upon our Thoughts, Affections, Aims, Purposes, or Intentions, and the Sincerity of them. None of these is or can be hid from the Eye of Conscience, which knows them all, and is thereby qualified to be both Witness and Judge of them. St. Paul, Rom. 9. 1, 2. appeals to his Conscience as witness of his speaking the Truth, and of the great Affection he bare to his Country-men: I say the Truth in Christ, I lye not, my Conscience bearing me witness, that I have great Heaviness and continual Sorrow in my Heart, &c.

And in like manner, 2 Cor. 1. 12. he tells of his Conscience's bearing Testimony of his Conversation and Sincerity: Our Rejoycing is this, the Testimony of our Conscience, that in Simplicity and godly Sincerity we have had our Conversation in the World. I add, That tho' Mr. Locke only mentions our own Actions, yet it is apparent, even from Scripture, that Conscience also judgeth of the Actions and Conversations...
fations of others. We commend our selves to every Man's Conscience, says the Apostle, 2 Cor. 4. 2. i.e. We endeavour to order our Speech, Actions, and Conversation so, as that every Man's Conscience cannot but judge and think well of them. So, 2 Cor. 5. 11. We (says he) are made manifest to God, and I trust that we are also made manifest in your Consciences; q.d. God knows and is Witness of our sincere Purpose, and I hope that your Consciences are also satisfied of it, and ready to bear Testimony to it. Add to these 1 Cor. 10. 28, 29. If any Man say to you, This is offer'd in Sacrifice to Idols, eat not for his sake that shew'd it, and for Conscience sake: Conscience, I say, not thine own, but the others; for why is my Liberty judg'd of another Man's Conscience? In this Case, tho' I am satisfied in mine own Conscience, that I am at liberty, and may lawfully eat; yet I must forbear, for the sake of the other Man's Conscience: For, why should my Liberty be judged by another's Conscience? i.e. Why should I use my Liberty, and eat then, when another Man's Conscience will judge that I have sin'd in eating, and entertain Jealouysies or hard Thoughts of me. This may suffice for Mr. Lock's Description of Conscience.

He might have express'd himself more plainly than he has done, when he says, That Morality establish'd upon its true Foundations, cannot but determine the Choice in any one who will but consider. He hath not plainly told us what those true Foundations are; but if he mean by them, that infinite Happiness and Misery, those Rewards and Punishments of another Life, which he mentions in the Words following, I would ask, whether it be not rather the Consideration of those Foundations which so effectually determines the Choice, than the Consideration of the Morality that is establish'd upon them. I the rather ask this Question, because Mr. Lock, in this
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very Place (Essay, i. 2. c. 21. §. 70.) says expressly, That the Rewards and Punishments of another Life, which the Almighty hath establish'd as the Enforcement of his Laws, are of weight enough to determine the Choice against whatever Pleasure or Pain this Life can shew. He speaks also of the Foundations of Morality, in Essay, i. 4. c. 3. §. 18. but there likewise he doth not acquaint us what those Foundations are. His Words are these, The Idea of a Supreme Being, Infinite in Power, Goodness, and Wisdom, whose Workmanship we are, and on whom we depend, and the Idea of our selves, as understanding rational Creatures, being such as are clear in us, would, I suppose, if duly considered and pursued, afford such Foundations of our Duty, and Rules of Action, as might place Morality amongst the Sciences capable of Demonstration; wherein I doubt not but from Principles as incontestable as those of the Mathematicks, by necessary Consequences the Measures of Right and Wrong might be made out.

Mr. Lock says, (in Essay, i. 2. c. 21. §. 48.) Were we determin'd by any thing but the last Result of our own Minds, judging of the good or evil of any Action, we were not free. Now if this be true, that the last Result of our Mind judging of the good or evil of any Action, determines us, and nothing else, how comes it that he affirms, (Ibid. §. 31, 33, 34.) That Uneasiness determines the Will, and also takes so much Pains to prove it, Ibid. §. 36, 37, 38, 39, 40? I would know whether Uneasiness doth determine the Wills of those who enjoy complete Happiness, as the Spirits of Just Men made perfect do. Tho' I do not deny that too many Mens Desires and sensual Appetites causing uneasiness in them, do determine them to act contrary to the last Result of their Minds, judging the Action to be evil: And so (to use Mr. Lock's Words, Ibid. §. 35.) they are from time to time in the State of that unhappy Complainers,
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Videm meliora proboque, deteriora sequor; which Sentence is allow'd for true, and made good by constant Experience: Therefore in the Heathen Poets we meet with many such Complaints. The Words immediately preceding those, Video meliora, &c. are these, Sed trahit invitam nova vis, aliudque Cupido Mens aliud suadet: That unhappy Wretch, (viz. Medea) complains, that tho' her Mind saw, and approved, and persuaded her to the better, yet the Vehemence of her Desire persuaded, yea, even hurried her to the worse, and made her unwillingly follow it. In like manner, in Euripides's Medea, Adq. 4. verf. fin. she complains that her Passion overcame her Reason, Θυμὸς Ἰ χέλων ὥς Ἐκεῖνην Βυθίναν. Yes, we find the like Complaints in Holy Writ, I delight in the Law of God after the inward Man: But I see another Law in my Members, warring against the Law of my Mind, and bringing me into Captivity to the Law of Sin. So then I with the Mind indeed serve the Law of God, but with the Flesh the Law of Sin, Rom. 7. 22, 23, 25. And so he in Laelantius, l. 4. c. 24. Volo equidem non peccare, sed vincor: Sentio me peccare, sed necessitate fragilitatis impellit, cui repugnare non possum. I readily grant, that Men in this State are not free, (for the Apostle tells us, that they are Captives and Slaves, sold under Sin, and have Reason to cry out, Wretched Man that I am! who shall deliver me?) and that (as Mr. Lock says in Essay, l. 2. c. 21. § 47.) 'tis the Perfection of our Nature to desire, will, and act, according to the last Result of a fair Examination; and therefore it would be a great Happiness, if we were determin'd by nothing else but the last Result of our Minds, judging those Actions to be good or evil which are really so. But, alas! too frequent Experience evinceth, that Mens sensual Desires, and the Uneasiness which those Desires do cause in them, do determine them many times to do contrary to the right Judgm.
ment of their Minds; and so, tho' with their Minds they serve the Law of God, i.e. their Minds judge that they should do that which the Law of God requires; yet with their Flesh they serve the Law of Sin, i.e. their fleshly Desires prevail and determine them to act contrary to the Law of God.

C H A P. XXVII.

Of the Securing our Future State, and the Punishment of those that would not follow Christ.

Since our Natural Faculties are not fitted to penetrate into the internal Fabrick and real Essences of Bodies, but yet plainly discover to us the Being of a God, and the Knowledge of our selves, enough to lead us into a full and clear Discovery of our Duty, and great Concernment; it will become us, as rational Creatures, to employ those Faculties in those Enquiries, and in that sort of Knowledge which is most suited to our natural Capacities, and carries in it our greatest Interest, i.e. the Condition of our Eternal Estate. No Man is so wholly taken up with the Attendance on the means of Living, as to have no spare time at all to think on his Soul, and inform himself in Matters of Religion. Were Men as intent upon this as they are on things of lower Concernment, there are none so enslave'd to the Necessity of Life, who might not find many Vacancies that might be husbanded to this Advantage of their Knowledge. Mr. Lock, in Essay, l. 4. c. 12. §. 11. and c. 19. §. 3. The Punishment of those who would not follow him, (i.e. Christ,) was to lose their Souls, i.e. their Lives, Mark 8. 35--38. as is plain, considering the Occasion
OBSERVATIONS.

When Mr. Lock says, That the Punishment of those who would not follow Christ, was to lose their Souls, i.e. their Lives. This is usher'd in with the Words, And therefore; and yet it is not easie to perceive how this is inferre'd from that which Mr. Lock had said before, or how it proves or illustrates it; so that perhaps these Conjunctions, And therefore, are here to be look'd upon as some of Mr. Lock's privileged Particles. But to wave that, he allledged for this, St. Mark 8. 35—38. whereas, in v. 38, there is not that Expression of losing their Souls, but it is said, that the Son of Man will be abhorr'd of them when he cometh in the Glory of his Father with the Holy Angels; and consequently he will not then own them, but contrariwise say, I know you not, depart from me into everlasting Fire prepar'd for the Devil and his Angels. This may help us to understand what is meant by the losing the Soul, v. 35. Mr. Lock understands by it their losing their Life, or (as he expresss it a little before) their dying, and ceasing to be: But how can ceasing to be conflict with the suffering the Torment of the everlasting Fire prepar'd for the Devil and the other lapsed Angels?

They shall lose their Souls, i.e. their Lives, as is plain, considering the Occasion it was spoke on. Thus Mr. Lock. We must therefore look back to find on what Occasion this was spoken. We are told, St. Mark 8. 31, 32, 33, 34. that our Saviour having openly foretold that he should be put to death, and rise again, Simon Peter rebuked him for it; but he, when he had rebuk'd Peter, call'd to him the Multitude, together with his Disciples, and said, If any
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one will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his Cross, and follow me. Then follows the mention of the losing their Souls, v. 35. Whosoever (says he) will save his Soul, shall lose it. We see now the Occasion of Christ's speaking these last Words; and I would know how it makes it plain, that by losing the Soul here is meant losing the Life, in Mr. Lock's Sense, i.e. as it signifies dying, and ceasing to be. For my part, I cannot but think that we may most safelv rely on St. Luke's Exposition: He, c. 9. v. 24. hath these Words, Whosoever will save his Soul, shall lose it, i.e. his Soul; but, v. 25. instead of lose his Soul, he hath lose himself: What is a Man profited, if he gain the whole World, and lose himself? Thus St. Luke. Nothing is more usual in Scripture than for the Soul to be put for the whole Person; and so St. Luke teaches us to expound it here. When other Evangelists say, And lose his own Soul, (see St. Matth. 16. 26. St. Mark 8. 36.) St. Luke says, And lose himself. The Punishment then of him that will not deny himself, and follow Christ is to lose his Soul, i.e. himself, both Body and Soul, to have both Soul and Body destroy'd in Hell. His corpus & animam perdunt pari-ter in Gehennam, says Origen, Homil. 36. in S. Luke.

C H A P. XXVIII.

Of the Church, also of Infallibility, and Transubstantiation.

IT was upon this Proposition, That Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of the living God, owned by St. Peter, that our Saviour said he would build his Church, Matth. 16. 16, 17, 18. The Confession made by St. Peter, Matth. 16. 16: is the Rock on which our Saviour
Saviour has promis'd to build his Church. Mr. Locke, Reasonab. of Christiian. p. 27. 48. The Romanists say, ’Tis best for Men, and so suitable to the Goodness of God, that there should be an infallible Judge of Controversies on Earth; and therefore there is one. And I by the same Reason, say, ’Tis better for Men that every Man himself should be infallible. I leave them to consider, whether by the Force of this Argument they shall think that every Man is so, Essay, l. 1. c. 4. §. 12. I know no other infallible Guide but the Spirit of God in the Scriptures; Second Vindication of Reasonab. of Christiian. p. 341. The Ideas of one Body and one Place, do so clearly agree, and the Mind has so evident a Perception of their Agreement, that we can never assent to a Proposition that affirms the same Body to be in two distant Places at once, however it should pretend to the Authority of a Divine Revelation: Since the Evidence, 1. That we deceive not our selves in ascribing it to God; 2. That we understand it right, can never be so great as the Evidence of our own intuitive Knowledge, whereby we discern it impossible for the same Body to be in two Places at once, Essay, l. 4. c. 18. §. 5.

Observations.

Mr. Locke often repeats it, That the Confeffion made by St. Peter, St. Matth. 16. 16. was the Rock on which Christ would build his Church. We have it in his Reafonab. of Chriftian. not only in the Places already allledged, but also in p. 102, 103, and 104, 105. If he would infer thence, that this Article alone, That Jesus is the Messiah, is neceffary to make Men Chriftians; or, that only these two Articles, That he is the Messiah, and, That he is the Son of God, are so neceffary, he may know that this cannot be deduced from it. If he argue thus, The Church
Church is founded upon these Articles, as upon a Rock; therefore only the Belief of them is necessary to make a Man a Member of the Church; I deny his Consequence, for more than the believing the first Foundation of the Church may be necessary to make a Man a Member of it.

As to the Words, This Rock, it is acknowledged that sundry of the ancient Expositors have interpreted it to be the Faith which St. Peter confessed. Upon this Rock will I build my Church, i.e. the Faith which thou hast confessed; so St. Chrysost. in St. Matth. Homil. 55. Christ called this Confession a Rock, &c. For it really is the Rock of Godliness; so St. Basil. Select. Orat. 25. What is this, upon this Rock I will build my Church? Upon this Faith on that which is said, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God; so St. August. Tract. 10. in primam Joannis. I may add Theophylad: Peter having confessed the Son of God, be (i.e. Christ,) faith, This Confession which thou hast confessed shall be the Foundation of Believers. Thus Theophyl. in loc.

But tho' these and other ancient Writers do by this Rock understand the Faith which was confessed, yet there want not among them those who make it to be the Author and Finisher of our Faith, viz. Christ. Upon those Words, 1 Cor. 3. 11. Other Foundation no Man can lay, than that which is laid, which is Jesus the Christ. Theodoret says thus, Blessed Peter laid this Foundation, or rather the Lord himself: For Peter having said, Thou art the Son of the living God, the Lord said, On this Rock I will build my Church: Be not ye therefore denominatred from Men, for Christ is the Foundation. The Interpreter Gloss in St. Matth. 16. 18. says, This Rock, i.e. Christ, in whom thou believest. And our Anselm, Ibid. as plainly, On this Rock, i.e. upon my self I will build my Church, q.d. Thou art so Peter, from me (Petra) the Rock, as that yet the Dignity of being the
An Account of

the Foundation is reserved for me. But St. Austin, tho' he was alluded as favouring the former Explication, yet is elsewhere as clearly and fully for this as you can desire. Therefore the Lord saith, On this Rock I will build my Church, because Peter had said, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God. Therefore, says he, on this Rock which thou hast confessed, I will build my Church. Christ was the Rock upon which Foundation even Peter himself was built; for other Foundation no Man can lay that which is laid, to wit, Christ Jesus. The Church therefore which is founded on Christ, &c. St. August. Tratat. 124. in Ioannem. And again, Thou art Peter, and on this Rock which thou hast confessed, on this Rock which thou hast known, saying, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, I will build my Church, i.e. upon my self, the Son of the living God, I will build my Church; I will build thee upon me, not me upon thee. Men that were willing to be built upon Men, said, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, i.e. Peter; but others who would not be built upon Peter, but upon Petra a Rock, said, I am of Christ. Thus St. August. de Verbis Domini; see Matth. Serm. 13. These plainly make this Rock to be Christ himself.

Besides these already mention'd, there occurs in the Writings of some of the Fathers a third Interpretation of the Rock here spoken of, viz. That which makes St. Peter to be the Person to whom Christ makes Promise of so great a Dignity, that he would build his Church upon him. The Roman Writers abound with Citations to this purpose, and tho' because some of them are out of Writings that are not judg'd to be of sufficient Authority, and in others of them they have not shew'd that Fidelity they ought to have done, many of them are of no weight, yet it is granted that some of the Ancients have inclin'd to this Sense of the Place; and therefore
therefore there is no Necessity that I should give
my self the trouble to transcribe their Words.
Mr. Lock may perhaps say, that this Exposition is
so much for the Advantage of the Papal Interest,
and in favour of the Bishop of Rome’s Universal
Pastorship, that Protestants must not admit of it.
But I answer, Why is it more for the Advantage of
the Papal Interest that St. Peter should be the Rock
on which Christ would build his Church, than it is
that he would give him the Keys of the Kingdom
of Heaven? Why do they who say that these
Words, On this Rock I will build my Church, were
spoken personally of Peter, more favour Popery
than they who will have those Words, To thee I
will give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, to
be said personally to Peter? For why may we not
argue as strongly for the universal Pastorship from
the latter Words, as from the former? And yet
Mr. Lock himself tells us expressly, that the latter
Words were said personally to Peter; see his Rea-
sonab. of Christian. p. 105. I think it not amiss
here to transcribe the Words of Episcopius, in loc.
Concedi atque indulgeri posse putaverim Pontificiis,
quod per Hanc Petram intelligatur ipsa persona Pe-
tri, idque quia probabilibus valde nituntur argumen-
tis. At vero dicet quis, sic datur Pontificiis quod vo-
lunt. Id vero pernegatur consequi. Etsi enim Petro
bic aliquid promittatur, aut de eo aliquid futurum
affirmetur, id tamen non fit cum aliorum Discipulorum
aut Apostolorum exclusione. Aliud enim longe est
Petro hoc dici, aliud soli Petro ea dixi que alii non
competant, aut eodem saltem jure aliis Discipulis tri-
buti nequeant. Primi concedi posse putamus, posterius
vero negamus, id enim sufficit plus quam sati ad Pri-
matum Petri, & quae ei (si quis suisset) ridiculce ad-
modum & solide superstruitur Pontificis Romani Pre-
rogativa, evertendum. Thus Episcopius. And there
are Protestant Divines of great Esteem for their
Learning
Learning and Judgment, and who have engaged as zealously as any other against the Papal Interest, who have gone farther, have not only made the Person of St. Peter to be meant by the Rock, but also somewhat peculiar to be granted him, and yet shew that this affords not the least Advantage to the Pope's Pretensions that he is Universal Pastor. To omit some of our English Divines, they that please may consult Cameron either in his Prælection, in St. Matth. 16. 18. or in the great Criticks.

Episcopus says that this, That the Church should be built on him as on a Rock, was granted to Peter in common with the other Apostles. And to the same purpose speaks Origen, Traítat. i. in Matth. If thou thinkest that the whole Church was built upon Peter alone, what wilt thou say of John the Son of Thunder, and every one of the Apostles? Shall we dare to say that the Gates of Hell could not prevail against St. Peter only, but could prevail against the rest? And a little after, If that saying, To thee I will give the Keys, was common to the other Apostles, why was not the rest which was then said as to Peter common to them too? So that this may be a fourth Exposition, that by the Rock is meant St. Peter, not alone but together with the other Apostles. As he made that Confession, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God, not for himself only, but also in the Name of the other Apostles; so, according to this Sense, he receiv'd this Grant for the rest of the Apostles as well as for himself.

I have allledged the foresaid Testimonies to satis-
fi Mr. Lock, That Persons of approved Piety as well as Learning, have judged our Saviour's Words, On this Rock I will build my Church, capable of other Interpretations than that which is mention'd by him, viz. That the Faith which was confessed by St. Peter, or thole Articles, That Jesus is the Christ, and, That he is the Son of the living God, are the Rock
on which the Church is built. This is the only Interpretation that can do Mr. Lock any Service, and therefore he takes no notice of the rest. But he should not be himself guilty of that which he condemns so much in others, i.e. the imposing his Interpretations of Scripture upon us. And therefore he must not be displeas'd, if we do not grant that which Mr. Lock here affirms without any Proof, that this Proposition, That Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of the living God, was that Rock on which our Lord said that he would build his Church.

Mr. Lock says, that the Evidence that we deceive not our selves in ascribing a Revelation to God, can never be so great as the Evidence of our own intuitive Knowledge; where, if his Meaning be, that we can never be so certain that any Revelation (suppose the Scripture) is from God, as we are of the Object of our intuitive Knowledge, I must deny it; for I firmly believe that there have been and may now be those, who are as certain that the Scriptures are the Word of God, as they can be of that which they clearly see, and distinctly perceive by any other of their Senses. And I am confirm'd in this Belief by the Words of Mr. Chillingworth, c. i. §. 9. To those (says he) that believe and live according to their Faith, God gives by degrees the Spirit of Oblegation and Confirmation, and to be as fully and resolutely assur'd of the Gospel of Christ, as those which heard it from Christ himself with their Ears, which saw it with their Eyes, which look'd upon it, and whose Hands handled the Word of Life.

CHAP.
Of Fundamentals, and the Apostles Creed.

God alone can appoint what shall be necessarily believ'd by every one whom he will justifie; and what he has so appointed and declared is alone necessary. No body can add to these Fundamental Articles of Faith, nor make any other necessary, but what God himself hath made and declared to be so. And what these are which God requires of those who will enter into and receive the Benefits of the New Covenant, has already been shewn. An explicit Belief of these is absolutely requir'd of all those to whom the Gospel of Jesus Christ is preached. Mr. Lock, Reaforab. of Christian. p. 301. The Primitive Church admitted converted Heathens to Baptism upon the Faith contain'd in the Apostles Creed. A bare Profession of that Faith, and no more, was required of them to be receiv'd into the Church, and made Members of Christ's Body. How little different the Faith of the ancient Church was from the Faith I have mention'd, may be seen in these Words of Tertullian: Regula fidei una omnium est sola immobialis, irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem, mundi conditorem, & Filium ejus Jesus Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in coelis, sedentem nunc ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos, per cunnis etiam resurrectionem. Hac lege Fidei manente cætera jam disciplinae & conversationis admit-tunt novitatem correctionis: Tert. de Virg. Velan. in princip. This was the Faith that in Tertullian's time sufficed to make a Christian. And the Church of England only proposes the Articles of the Apostles Creed to the Convert to be baptiz'd; and upon his professing a Belief of them, asks whether he will be baptiz'd
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baptiz'd in this Faith; and upon the Profession of this Faith, and no other, the Church baptizes him into it. The Apostles Creed is the Faith I was baptiz'd into, no one tittle whereof I have renounced, that I know. And, I heretofore thought that gave me title to be a Christian. Second Vindicat. p. 177, 178, 182. Thus Mr. Lock.

Observations.

Mr. Lock tells us, in Reasonab. of Christian. p. 301, that it had been already shewn what the Fundamental Articles of Faith are. But I ask, How had it been shewn? He had sometimes affirm'd positively, that this, that Jesus of Nazareth, is the only Gospel Article of Faith that was require'd, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 195. that Salvation or Perdition depends upon believing or rejecting this one Proposition, that Jesus was the Messiah. Ibid. p. 43. that this was all the Doctrine the Apostles propos'd to be believ'd. Ibid. p. 93. At other times he had said, that it was also require'd for the attaining of Life, that they should believe that Jesus is the Son of God. Ibid. p. 194. He had also spoke of concomitant Articles, viz. Christ's Resurrection, Rule, and coming again to judge the World, saying, that these, together with Jesus of Nazareth's being the Messiah, are all the Faith require'd as necessary to Justification. Ibid. p. 293, 294. Otherwhere he mentions his Suffering, and having fulfill'd all things that were written in the Old Testament concerning the Messiah; adding, that those that believ'd this, and repented, should receive Remission of their Sins through this Faith in him. Ibid. p. 190. Thus Mr. Lock had shewn what the Fundamental Articles of the Faith are, or rather, had shew'd how wavering and uncertain he himself is concerning them, assigning sometimes only one, sometimes two, sometimes more.
He brings the Words of Tertullian, de Virg. Velan. to shew how little different the Faith of the ancient Church was from the Faith he hath mention'd: but, 1. It would have been more for his Reputation, if the Faith which he mentions had not been at all different from that of the ancient Church. 2. Tertullian's Words there do not shew that the Faith of the ancient Church differ'd little from his. For by comparing the Rule of Faith which he lays down here with that which he gives us in Lib. de Praelect. adv. Heret. and in Lib. adv. Praxeum, it fully appears, that he did not design this for a complete Account of the Faith of the ancient Church; for, some things that are in this are omitted in the other; as, Omnipotentem (a Word certainly very material) is left out in both of them: and more things are added; as, Universa de nibilo produxerit per Verbum sium. Id Verbum Filium ejus appellatum, &c. Carnem faëcum, &c. Mississe vicaram vim Spiritus Sancti, is added in Lib. de Praelect. and so Sermo ejus per quem omnia faëta sunt, & fine quo faëta est nihil. Ex ea (i.e. Virgine) natum hominem & Deum, mortuum & sepultum; Qui miseric Spiritum Sanctum, is all superadded in Lib. adv. Praxeum. Tertullian therefore will not be found to be a Friend to Mr. Lock, who might rather have said, that it may be seen in Tertullian, how far different the Faith of the ancient Church was from the Faith he hath mention'd.

He tells us, that the Apostles Creed is the Faith he was baptiz'd into, and that he hath not renounced one tittle thereof that he knows. But hath he not renounced the Article of the Resurrection of the Body, when he tells us, that in his next Edition of his Essay of Humane Understanding he will have the Word Body blotted out, and change these Words of his Book, The dead Bodies of Men shall rise, into these, The dead shall rise? See his Third Letter, pag. 210.
C H A P. XXX.

Of Vertue and Vice, Self-denial and Education.

G O D hath, by an inseparable Connexion, joind Vertue and publick Happiness together, and made the Practice thereof necessary to the Preservation of Society, and visibly beneficial to all with whom the vertuous Man has to do. Mr. Lock, Essay, l. i. c. 3. §. 6. The Laws that Men generally refer their Actions to, to judge of their Retitude and Obliquity, seem to me to be these three; 1. The Divine Law. 2. The Civil Law. 3. The Law of Opinion or Reputation, if I may so call it. By the relation they bear to the first of these, Men judge whether their Actions are Sins or Duties; by the second, whether they be criminal or innocent; and by the third, whether they be Vertues or Vices. By Divine Law, I mean that Law which God has set to the Actions of Men, whether promulgated to them by the Light of Nature, or the Voice of Revelation. Vertue and Vice are Names pretended and suppos'd every where to stand for Actions in their own nature right or wrong; and as far as they really are so apply'd, they so far are coincident with the Divine Law above-mention'd. But yet whatever is pretended, this is visible, that these Names of Vertue and Vice, in the particular Instances of their Application through the several Nations and Societies of Men in the World, are constantly attributed only to such Actions as in each Country or Society are in Reputation or Discredit. Thus the measure of what is every where call'd and esteem'd Vertue and Vice, is this Approbation or Dislike, Praise or Blame, which by a secret or tacit Consent establishes it self in the several Societies, Tribes, and Clubs of Men in the World.
World; whereby several Actions come to find Credit or Disgrace among them, according to the Judgment, Maxims, and Fashions of that place. By this Approbation and Dislike they establish among themselves what they will call Vertue and Vice. Esteem and Discredit, Vertue and Vice, do yet in a great measure everywhere correspond with the unchangeable Rule of Right and Wrong which the Law of God hath established; there being nothing that so directly and visibly secures and advances the general Good of Mankind in this World, as Obedience to the Laws he hath set them, and nothing that breeds such Mischiefs and Confusion as the Neglect of them. And therefore Men, without renouncing all Sense and Reason, and their own Interest, which they are so constantly true to, could not generally mistake in placing their Commendation and Blame on that side that really deserved it not. Nay, even those Men whose Practice was otherwise, fail'd not to give their Approbation right, few being deprav'd to that degree, as not to condemn at least in others the Faults they themselves were guilty of; whereby even in the Corruption of Manners, the true Boundaries of the Law of Nature, which ought to be the Rule of Vertue and Vice, were pretty well preserv'd. So that even the Exhortations of inspir'd Teachers have not fear'd to appeal to common Repute, Whatsoever is lovely, whatsover is of good Report, if there be any Vertue, if there be any Praife, &c.

Ibid. l. 2. c. 28. §. 7, 8, 10, 11. The Foundation of Vice lies in wrong measures of Good. Ibid. l. 4. c. 19. §. 16. Reputation is not the true principle and measure of Vertue, for that is the knowledge of a Man's Duty, and the satisfaction it is to obey his Maker in following the Dictates of that Light God has given him, with the hopes of Acceptation and Reward. I place Vertue as the first and most necessary of those Endowments that belong to a Man or a Gentleman, as absolutely requisite to make him valued and beloved by others,
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others, acceptable or tolerable to himself; without that I think he will neither be happy in this nor the other World. Of Education, p. 61, 157. It seems plain to me, that the Principle of all Virtue and Excellency lies in a Power of denying our selves the Satisfaction of our own Desires, where Reason doth not authorize them. This Power is to be got and improved by Custom, made easy and familiar by an early Practice. He that has not a Mastery over his Inclinations, be that knows not how to resist the Importunity of present Pleasure and Pain for the sake of what Reason tells him is fit to be done, wants the true Principle of Virtue and Industry. This Temper therefore, so contrary to unguided Nature, is to be got betimes; and this Habit, as the true foundation of future Ability and Happiness, is to be wrought into the Mind as early as may be, and so to be confirmed by all the Care and Ways imaginable. Ibid. p. 37, 38, 46. Christ commands Self-denial, and the exposing our selves to Suffering and Danger, rather than to deny or disown him. Reasonab. of Christian, p. 224. As the foundation of Virtue, there ought very early to be imprinted in the Minds of Children a true Notion of God, as of the independent supreme Being, Author and Maker of all things, from whom we receive all our Good, that loves us, and gives us all things, hears and sees every thing, and does all manner of Good to those that love and obey him, and consequent to it a Love and Reverence of him. They must be taught also to pray to him. The Lord's Prayer, the Creeds, and ten Commandments, 'tis necessary they should learn perfectly by heart. The Knowledge of Virtue all along from the beginning, in all the Instances they are capable of, being taught them more by Practice than Rules, I know not whether they should read any other Discourses of Morality but what they find in the Bible. Of Education, p. 157, 158, 185; 1204. Thus Mr. Lock.
OBSERVATIONS.

When Mr. Lock, in Essay i. 2. c. 28. §. 7. having nam’d three distinct Laws, the Divine Law, the Civil Law, and the Law of Opinion or Reputation (as he calls it) says, that by the first Men judge whether their Actions are Sins or Duties, by the second whether they be criminal or innocent, by the third whether they be Vertues or Vices, doth he not plainly distinguish Sins and Duties from Vices and Vertues? For, 1. He makes Men to judge of Vices and Vertues by one Law, of Sins and Duties by another. 2. They judge by an infallible Rule of the one, by a very fallible one of the other. 3. Criminal and Innocent, are plainly distinct from Sins and Duties; and so we cannot but judge, that according to Mr. Lock, Vices and Vertues are distinct from both. Now if so, it might not be amiss, if he would inform us where the Distinction between them lies; for I have always thought that there is a very near Affinity as between Vice and Sin on the one hand, so between Vertue and Duty on the other hand. But tho’, according to Mr. Lock, Men do judge of Vertue and Vice by his Law of Opinion and Reputation; yet he will not say that they ought to do so. He tells us here, §. 11. that the Law of Nature ought to be the Rule of Vertue and Vice, and expresses it more largely in his Epistle to the Reader: The Law of Nature, says he, is that standing and unalterable Rule by which Men ought to judge of the moral Rectitude and Pravity of their Actions, and accordingly denominate them Vertues or Vices. But I had rather say, that the Law which ought to be the Rule whereby Men judge of Sins and Duties, ought also to be the Rule by which they are to judge of Vices and Vertues, and that is the Divine Law, which (Mr. Lock himself being Judge) comprehends more than the Law of Nature.

By
Mr. Lock's Religion, &c. 133

By the Divine Law (says he here, § 8.) I mean that Law which God has set to the Actions of Men, whether promulgated to them by the Light of Nature, or the Voice of Revelation. So (say I) the Law of God comprehending both the Law of Nature and his revealed Law, is the Rule whereby Men ought to judge of Vertues and Vices.

But Mr. Lock will prove, that his Law of Opinion or Reputation, or (as he also expresses it) Approbation or Dislike, Praise or Blame, is the common measure of Vertue and Vice. This (says he) will appear to any one who considers that every where Vertue and Praise, Vice and Blame, go together. Vertue is every where that which is thought praise-worthy, and nothing else but that which has the Allowance of publick Esteem is call'd Vertue. Thus Mr. Lock here, viz. l. 2. c. 28. § 11. But I would know whether he speaks of true and real, or of reputed Vertue: if of reputed, it is not to the purpose, since every one will grant, without Proof, that his Law of Reputation is the Rule of reputed Vertue; and it signifies no more than this, that that is reputed Vertue which is reputed such. Besides, how can it be worth the while to enquire after the Rule of reputed Vertue? If on the other side, he speak of true real Vertue, I believe that no Man before him ever said that true Vertue and Praise every where went together. Constant Experience may teach every Man the contrary. It is very rarely that true Vertue hath met with such Entertainment in the World: but, on the other hand, it would fill large Volumes, if we could set down all the Instances of reproach'd and despis'd Vertue, which the several Ages of the World have afforded.

Mr. Lock goes on, and tells us, that Vertue and Praise are so united, that they are call'd often by the same name. His Meaning is, that Vertue is call'd often by the name of Praise; but he gives us only two Instances of it. The one is out of Virgil, Aeneid.
Æneid. l. 1. Sunt sua præmia laudi; where laudi is
by some interpreted virtuti, by others factis laudabilibus, or gestis bellicis: but the whole Verfe is
this: En Priamus, sunt hic etiam sua præmia laudi:
and why may not laudi have here the usual Signifi-
cation? Certainly, though I shall not be confident
that it is the right Interpretation of the Verfe, yet
if referring sua to Priamus I should confirme it thus,
Lo Priamus, here also are his rewards to his Praise,
I believe Mr. Lock would not find it very easie to
confute it. The other Instance is out of Cicero, Tusc.
Qu. l. 2. whose Words Mr. Lock hath transcript'd,
but I shall do it more fully: Nihil habet præstanti-
us, nihil quod magis expetat, quam bonestatem, quam
laudem, quam dignitatem, quam decus. Hifice ego
pluribus nominibus unam rem declarari volo, sed utor,
ut quamma maxime significem, pluribus. Volo autem di-
cere illud homini longe optimum esse, quod ipsum sit
optandum per se, a virtute profectum vel in ipsa vir-
tute situm, sua sponte laudabile; quod quidem citius
dixerim solum quam summum bonum. Thus Cicero,
who himself declares what that one thing is which
he would signifie by all those Names, viz. the chief
or rather only Good, which is praiife-worthy and de-
firable for it felf, proceeds from Vertue, or is placed
in Vertue. We need then no other Commentary but
Tully's own. That which he signifie by Homestatem,
Laudem, Dignitatem, Decem, is the chief Good, con-
cerning which he would not determine whether it
proceed from Vertue, or consists in it. It doth not ap-
pear then by these Citations out of Virgil and Tully,
that they call'd Vertue and Praise by the fame Name.
But I shall be fo liberal to Mr. Lock, as to suppose
that those two great Persons, and other good Writers,
have call'd Vertue by the Name of Praise, it will do
him no Service after all, unless they did this for the
Reason which he assigns, viz. because Vertue and
Praise are united, and every where go together; and
therefore
therefore it is incumbent upon him to prove that they did it for this Reason, which is a very difficult Task. I on the other side can easily assign more probable Reasons why they might do it. If any call Vertue by the Name of Praife, they had good ground for doing it, because true Vertue is always praife-worthy, and Men ought evermore to praife and celebrate it, tho' it too often meets with a contrary Reward from the World, is reproached and despis'd; as Vice on the other hand is too frequently magnified and extolled.

But Mr. Lock endeavours to perswade us that reputed and true Vertue are in a great measure the same. For so he says here, that Esteem and Discredit, Vertue and Vice, do in a great measure every where correspond with the unchangeable Rule of Right and Wrong, which the Law of God hath established. And again, Men without renouncing all Sense and Reason and their own Interest, could not generally mistake in placing their commendation and blame on that side that really deserved it not. Again, In the corruption of manners the true Boundaries of the Law of Nature, which ought to be the Rule of Vertue and Vice, were pretty well preserved, for which he alledges, Phil. 4. 8. He had said in the words immediately preceeding, that even those Men whose practice was otherwise fail'd not to give their Approbation right, few being deprav'd to that degree as not to condemn at least in others the faults they themselves were guilty of. Thus Mr. Lock, in Essay, l. 2. c. 28. §. 11. And in his Epistle to the Reader he says, that Men in that way of denomining their Actions did not for the most part much vary from the Law of Nature.

For answer to this, 1. How doth that which Mr. Lock says (viz. that few were deprav'd to that degree as not to condemn at least in others the faults they themselves were guilty of) agree with Rom. 1. 32. and other places of Scripture? In Rom. 1. 32. it is said, that they (i.e., the Gentiles) not only did
the same (viz. the things that are mentioned in the preceding Verses) but took pleasure in them that did them. They were not ignorant, that they who commit such things are worthy of Death, and yet practis'd them themselves, and not only so but they also approv'd of others that practis'd them. For so the word αὐθεντήσας may be rendered Comprobant. St. Chrysostome, in loc. expounds it by Praising, συμπαραστησας, and so again συμπαραστησας, and is follow'd by Oecumenius. Theophylact interprets it by συμπαραστησας, they patronize or defend others that do them, appear as Advocates for them, so far they are from condemning them. So they that forsake the Law will praise the wicked Man, Prov. 28. 4. Those that keep the Law (as it follows there) will contend with wicked Men, but those that forsake it will be so far from contending with them, or condemning them, that contrariwise they will praise them. The Apostle also tells of some whose Glory is in their Shame, Phil. 3. 19. How then can Mr. Lock say that there are few deprav'd to that degree as not to condemn in others the faults they themselves are guilty of? When the Scripture speaks of those that make their Shame matter of glorying, and of so many that instead of condemning did praise, approve, and take pleasure in those that live in the practice of most heinous Sins. Also, how can he say as he doth, that Vice and Blame everywhere go together? when we are so plainly told in Holy Writ, that Vice and Praise so often go together, that Vice in this World meets with the Reward due to Vertue, is approved, applauded, commended.

2. How can he say that reputed Vertue and Vice, in a great measure, every where corresponds to that which the Law of God hath establish'd to be Vertue and Vice? when he tells us, that what is counted a Vertue in one Country, passes for Vice in another: For the Opinions of these Countries being directly contrary
contrary the one to the other, it is impossible that both of them should in any measure correspond with the Law of God. If the Divine Law have determin'd on the part of that Country which esteems such a thing to be a Vertue, then the Opinion of the other Country in which it is reputed to be a Vice cannot be agreeable to that Law; and if it hath not determin'd either way, either that it is a Vertue, or that it is a Vice, then neither of the two Opinions can pretend to agree with it. I know what Mr. Lock faith, Though what was thought praiseworthy in one place escaped not censure in another, and so in different Societies Vertues and Vices were changed; yet as to the main, they for the most part kept the same everywhere. But, 1. We may observe how cautiously and timorously he expresseth it; As to the main, and for the most part: it seems the one Expression would not secure him, without superadding the other. 2. It will be no difficulty to shew that as to the main, and for the most part, they were not the same: for, all that is necessary to this is, to make it appear, that the Opinions of the Philosophers among the Heathens concerning Vertue and Vice, were not the same (as to the main, and for the most part) with the Opinions of those who judged of them by the Rule of the Law of God. Aristotle Politic. l. 7. c. 16. teaches it to be lawful to procure an Abortion before that which is conceived hath Life and Sense. Diogenes Laertius, in the Life of Zeno, tells of some that taught not only the Lawfulness of Self-murther, but also the Reasonableness of it. Cicero de Invent. l. 2. vers. fin. joins Revenge with Religion, Piety, Veracity, &c. and refers them all to that which he calls Natura jus; and it is a known Speech of his, ad Attic. l. 9. c. 14. Odi hominem & odero, utinam uelisci poscem. And Aristotle, Ethic. l. 4. c. 11. will scarce excuse him from being faulty that doth not revenge himself. They
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They that please, may see how much Cicero in Orat. pro M. Cælio says in defence of Meretricalii amores, Si quis est qui etiam Meretricalii amoribus interdictione juvenitii putet, est ille quidem valde severus, &c. The Community of Wives, and murthering such Infants as were weak and sickly, or deformed, was taught by the Laws of Lycurgus (see Plutarcb. in Lycurgo) and Community of Wives by Xenophon, de Republ. Lacedem. We are told also by Tertullian Apologet. c. 39. that Socrates among the Greeks, and Cato among the Romans, lent their Wives to others; and Strabo, l. 11. with several others, testifies the fame of Cato, and adds, that this was the ancient Custom of the Romans. Yea Diogenes the Cynick, and Plato, and the Stoicks Zeno and Chrysippus, were all of Opinion that Wives ought to be common, as Diogenes Laertius in Zenone informs us; and they that desire to see Plato’s Judgment, may consult him de Republ. l. 5. and other where. As these that I have mention’d agreed with Lycurgus as to the Community of Wives, so there were too many that were for the Lawfulness of exposing or murthering Children, as he was. We may justly admire that Seneca, de Ira, l. 1. c. 15. should give such Advice as he does. At corrige nequeunt, nihilque in illis bone spei capax est. Tollantur et caetu mortalium. Portentosus factus extingui mus, liberos quoque fi debiles monstrosique sint editi mergimus: so he. Cicero, de Natur. Deor. l. 3. vers. fin. counted it a fault to acknowledge that we owe any Vertue to God; that (says he) is not a Gift from God, we have it of our selves. His Words are these; Virtutem nemo unquam acceptam Deo retulit, nimimum relâ. Propter virtutem enim jure laudamus, & de virtute relâ gloriariamur, quod non contingere, fi id donum a Deo non a nobis habere must. I shall add only one Instance more out of Sextus Empiricus Pyrrhon. Hypotyp. l. 3, where he shews that the Stoicks allow’d Pedareas, together
Mr. Lock's Religion, &c. 139

together with the foulest Incests, citing the Words of Zeno and Chrysippus. The very same is charg'd upon that Sect by Theophilus Antioch, ad Autolyct. 1. 3. And as to Pædarestry, the Words of Tatianus, con. Graecos, p. 164, 165. are most apposite to our Purpose, especially if the Latin Interpreter hath rendred them right: Barbari puerorum amores damnent, idem apud Romanos prerogativa dignantur. Much more might have been added, but this is more than enough to confute Mr. Lock's strange Assertion, That Esteem and Discredit, Vertue and Vice, do in a great measure every where correspond with the unchangeable Rule of Right and Wrong, which the Law of God hath established; or (as he expresses it in his Epistle to the Reader) that Men in denominating Vertue and Vice, did not, for the most part, much vary from the Law of Nature.

But Mr. Lock will prove this from Scripture: Even the Exhortations of inspired Teachers have not fear'd (I suppose he means even inspir'd Teachers in their Exhortations have not fear'd) to appeal to common Repute. Whatsoever is lovely, whatsoever is of good Report, if there be any Vertue, if there be any Praise, &c. Phil. 4. 8. Thus Mr. Lock, Essay, I. 2. c. 28. §. 11. But in what Words doth the Apostle appeal to common Repute? Not in the Word Vertue, for by that he undoubtedly means real Vertue; not in the Word Praise, for by it is understood that which is truly Praise-worthy. (sua sponte laudabile, as Tully says;) not in the Words, whatsoever is lovely, for Oecumenius in loc. teaches us to understand thereby whatsoever is amiable in the Eyes of God, or of the Faithful, (τὰ τοῦ ἀγίου, ἃ τις ἐστὶν.) Is it then in the Words, whatsoever is of good Report, that he appeals to it? It must be in these if in any. But, 1. As Oecumenius teaches us to understand the former Words, whatsoever is lovely, not in the Eyes of all Men but of the Faithful; fo
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why may we not restrain the latter Words thus, *Whatsoever is of good Report, i.e. with good Men, or with those who know how to make a right Estimate of things, who have their Senses exercis'd to discern between good and evil?* 2. Or may not the Words be expounded thus, *Whatsoever is in it self, or of its own Nature, such as deserves that we should be well spoken of for it, or such as Men cannot but speak well of us for it, whosoever they be, whether Christians, or those that are without.* St. Paul would have us to do all such things as Men ought to speak well of, but not every thing which any one may speak well of, for some may *speak well of the Covetous, whom the Lord abhorreth,* Psal. 10. 3. and that may be highly esteemed with Men which is an Abomination in the Sight of God. It is then a great Mistake to think that the Apostle here appeals to common Esteem and Repute; which is so uncertain, that if it was the Measure of Vertue and Vice, by reason of the different Temper, Education, Fashion, Judgment, Maxims, and Interest of Men in several Ages and Places, it would fall out, that what is Vertue in one Age would be Vice in another, as Mr. Locke confesses, that what is accounted Vertue in one place, passeth for Vice in another. That which is so uncertain and changeable cannot but vary much from the certain and unchangeable Rule of Right and Wrong, *viz. the Law of God,* let Mr. Locke pretend to the contrary what he will, and plead as much as he will for his Law of Opinion and Reputation.

When Mr. Locke says, that *Men are so constantly true to their Interest,* he cannot surely mean their chiefest Interest, *viz. the Interest of their Souls,* for he must needs be sensible how regardless Men are of that, and how ready to betray it.

Tho' in his Treatise of Education, *p. 61.* he says, That *Reputation is not the true Principle and Measure of Vertue,* yet he adds, That *it is that which comes*
Mr. Lock's Religion, &c. comes nearest to it. But it may do well, if he please, to explain what he means by its coming nearest the true Principle and Measure of Vertue.

When in his Treatise of Education, p. 185. he says, the Lord's Prayer, the Creeds, and Ten Commandments, &c. doth he by the Creeds understand those Three Creeds which we have in our Liturgy, call'd the Apostle's, the Nicene, and Athanasian? Or is Creeds put for Creed by the Mistake of the Press?

C H A P. XXXI.

Of the Resurrection of the Body, the Day of Judgment, and Eternal Rewards and Punishments.

The Resurrection of the Body after Death is above Reason: That the Bodies of Men shall rise and live again, this being beyond the Discovery of Reason, is purely a Matter of Faith, with which Reason has directly nothing to do, Mr. Lock, Essay, l. 4. c. 17. §. 23. and c. 18. §. 7. Divine Justice shall bring to Judgment at the last Day the very same Persons, to be happy or miserable in the other, who did well or ill in this Life. He who at first made us begin to subsist here sensible intelligent Beings, and for several Years continued us in such a State, can and will restore us to the like State of Sensibility in another World, and make us capable there to receive the Retribution he has design'd to Men according to their Doings in this Life, Ibid. l. 1. c. 4. §. 5. and l. 4. c. 3. §. 6. We groan within our selves, waiting for the Adoption, to wit, the Redemption of our Body, Rom. 8. 23. whereby is plainly meant the Change of these frail mortal Bodies into the spiritual immor-
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immortal Bodies at the Resurrection, when this Mortal shall have put on Immortality, 1 Cor. 15. 54. Reasonab. of Christian. p. 206. This being the Case, that whoever is guilty of any Sin should certainly die and cease to be, the Benefit of Life restor’d by Christ at the Resurrection, would have been no great Advantage (for as much as here again Death must have seiz’d upon all Mankind, because all had sinned, for the Wages of Sin is every where Death, as well after as before the Resurrection) if God had not found out a way to justifie some, Ibid. p. 15. The Scripture is express, that the same Persons shall be rais’d and appear before the Judgment-Seat of Christ, that every one may receive according to what he has done in his Body. The Third Letter, p. 196. In the New Testament I find our Saviour and the Apostles to preach the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Resurrection from the Dead in many Places; and the Resurrection of the Dead, I acknowledge to be an Article of the Christian Faith. But I do not remember any Place where the Resurrection of the same Body is so much as mention’d. Nay, I do not remember in any Place of the New Testament (where the general Resurrection of the last Day is spoken of) any such Expression as the Resurrection of the Body, much less of the same Body, Ibid. p. 166. When I writ my Essay, I took it for granted, as I doubt not but many others have done, that the Scripture had mention’d in express Terms the Resurrection of the Body; but looking more narrowly into what Revelation has declar’d concerning the Resurrection, I find no such express Words in the Scripture, as that the Body shall rise or be rais’d, or the Resurrection of the Body. I shall therefore, in the next Edition of it, change these Words of my Essay, 1. 4. c. 18. §. 7. The dead Bodies of Men shall rise, into these of the Scripture, The Dead shall rise. Not that I question that the Dead shall be rais’d with Bodies, Ibid. p. 210.
Th'o' I do by no means deny that the same Bodies shall be rais'd at the last Day, yet I see nothing said to prove it to be an Article of Faith. Ibid. p. 195. The Apostle tells us, at the great Day, when every one shall receive according to his Doings, the Secrets of all Hearts shall be laid open. The Sentence shall be justified by the Consciousness all Persons shall have, that they themselves are the same that committed those Actions, and deserve that Punishment for them, Essay, I. 2. c. 27. §. 26. Christ himself, who knew for what he should condemn Men at the last Day, assures us in the two Places where he describes his Proceeding at the great Judgment, that the Sentence of Condemnation passes only on the Workers of Iniquity, such as neglected to fulfill the Law in Acts of Charity, Matth. 7. 23. Luke 13. 27. Matth. 25. 42. That Men may not be deceived by mistaking the Doctrine of Faith, Grace, Free Grace, and the Pardon and Forgiveness of Sin, and Salvation by Christ, (which was the great End of his Coming,) be more than once declares to them, for what Omissions and Miscarriages he shall judge and condemn to death even those who have own'd him, and done Miracles in his Name, when he comes at last to render to every one according to what he hath done in the Flesh, sitting upon his great and glorious Tribunal at the end of the World; see John 5. 28, 29. Matth. 13. 14. 16. 24, &c. Reasonab. of Christian. p. 9. 241, 242, 243, 244, 245. I am going to a Tribunal that hath a Right to judge of Thoughts. The Third Letter, p. 98. The eternal Condition of a future State infinitely outweighs the Expellation of Riches, or Honour, or any other Worldly Pleasure we can propose to our Selves. The Happiness of another Life shall certainly be agreeable to every one's Wife or Defire. The Rewards and Punishments of another Life, which the Almighty has established as the Enforcements of his Law, are of Weight enough to determine the Choice against whatever Pleasure
sure or Pain this Life can shew, when the eternal State is consider'd in its bare Possibility, which no body can make any doubt of. He that will allow exquisite and endless Happiness to be but the possible Consequence of a good Life here, or the contrary State the possible Reward of a bad one, must own himself to judge very much amiss, if he does not conclude that a Vertuous Life, with the certain Expecation of everlasting Bliss which may come, is to be preferr'd to a vicious one, with the Fear of that dreadful State of Misery which 'tis very possible may overtake the Guilty, or at best the terrible uncertain Hope of Anihilation. This is evidently so, tho' the vertuous Life here had nothing but Pain, and the vicious continual Pleasure, which yet is for the most part quite otherwise, and wicked Men have not much the odds to brag of, even in their present Possession, nay, all things considered rightly, have I think the worst part here. But when infinite Happiness is put in one Scale against infinite Misery in the other, if the worst that comes to the pious Man if he mistake, be the best that the wicked Man can attain to if he be in the right, who can without madness run the Venture? Who in his Wits would chuse to come within a Possibility of infinite Misery, which if he misses, there is yet nothing to be got by that Hazard: Whereas, on the other hand, the Sober Man ventures nothing against Happiness to be got if his Expecation comes to pass. If the good Man be in the right, he is eternally happy; if he mistake, he is not miserable, he feels nothing. On the other side, if the wicked be in the right, he is not happy; if he mistake, he is infinitely miserable. Must it not be a most manifest wrong Judgment that does not presently see to which side in this Case the Preference is to be given? I have forborne to mention any thing of the Certainty or Probability of a future State, designing here to shew the wrong Judgment that any one must allow he makes upon his own
own Principles, laid how be please, who prefers
the short Pleasures of a vicious Life upon any Consi-
deration, whilst he knows and cannot but be certain
that a future Life is at least possible, Essay, I. 2. c. 21.
§. 38, 65, 70. Nothing of Pleasure or Pain in this
Life can bear any Proportion to endless Happiness or
exquisite Misery of an immortal Soul hereafter. Let
a Man see that Virtue and Religion are necessary to
his Happiness, let him look into the future State of
Bliss or Misery, and see there God the righteous
Judge ready to render to every one according to his
Deeds; to them that by patient Continuance in well-
doing, seek for Glory, and Honour, and Immortal-
ity, eternal Life; but to every Soul that doth evil,
Indignation and Wrath, Tribulation and Anguish: To
him, I say, who hath a Prospect of the different
State of perfect Happiness or Misery, that attends
all Men after this Life, depending on their Behaviour
here, the measures of Good and Evil that govern his
Choice, are mightily changed, Ibid. §. 60. Our Sa-
vior requires the Obedience of his Disciples to seve-
ral of the Commands of the Moral Law he aforeh lays
upon them, with the Enforcement of unspeakable Re-
wards and Punishments in another World, according
to their Obedience or Disobedience, Reasonab. of
Christian. p. 234. The Son of God would in vain
have come into the World, to lay the Foundation of a
Kingdom, and gather together a select People out of
the World, if (they being found guilty at their Ap-
pearance before the Judgment-Seal of the righteous
Judge of all Men at the last Day) instead of En-
trance into eternal Life in the Kingdom he had pre-
pared for them, they should receive Death, the just
Reward of Sin, which every one of them was guilty
of. This second Death would have left him no Sub-
jects, Ibid. p. 211. Open Mens Eyes upon the endless
unspeakable Joys of another Life, and their Hearts
will find something solid and powerful to move them
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to live well here. The View of Heaven and Hell will cast a Slight upon the short Pleasures and Pains of this present State, and give Attractions and Encouragements to Vertue, which Reason and Interest, and the Care of our selves, cannot but allow, Ibid. p. 291, 292. Thus Mr. Lock:

OBSERVATIONS.

As to the Article of the Resurrection, the first Enquiry must be, Whether there are to be found any such express Words in the Scripture, as that the Body shall rise or be raised, or the Resurrection of the Body, where the general Resurrection is spoken of. If, when Mr. Lock denies that such express Words are found in the Scripture (see his Third Letter, p. 210.) his Meaning be, that those very express Words are not found, I grant that they are not; but if he mean farther, that express Words which signifie the very same thing are not to be found, the contrary will easily appear.

In Rom. 8. 23. there are these express Words, the Redemption of our Body; and Mr. Lock, in Reason of Christian. p. 206. tells us, that thereby is plainly meant the Change of these frail mortal Bodies into the spiritual immortal Bodies at the Resurrection, when this Mortal shall have put on Immortality. In the same Chapter, v. 11. we find these express Words, Quicken your mortal Bodies. He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal Bodies, ζωοκομοεσθαι, shall make them to live, restore them to Life after Death, as he restored the crucified Body of Christ to Life; so that to quicken our mortal Bodies, is the same with raising them. And Mr. Lock, in his Third Letter, p. 199. saying, that in the New Testament it is said, Raise the Dead, Quicken or make alive the Dead, the Resurrection of the Dead, clearly makes to Quicken and to Raise to signifie the same. And St. Chrysostom (not to mention Oecumenius and Theo-
Theophrastus, who follow him, gives a Reason why St. Paul says, Quicken or give Life to our mortal Bodies, rather than raise them, viz. Because he here speaks only of those who should be raised to Life, (i.e. a blissful or happy Life,) viz. the Faithful, who have the Spirit of God dwelling in them; not of the Wicked, who shall also be rais'd, but (says he) unto Punishment, not unto Life. There is a third Text which hath so near a Resemblance to these, that it may well be join'd with them, viz. Phil. 3. 21. Who shall change our vile Body, that it may be conformed to his glorious Body. When shall the Saviour the Lord Christ effect this wonderful Change, that our vile Body shall be made conformable to his glorious Body? Surely then, when he shall quicken or raise it, and that will be when he comes from Heaven to judge the World, see v. 20. Here is not indeed the Word Raise, but it is plainly imply'd. The Blessed Jesus when he comes from Heaven will raise our vile Body, and make it conform'd to his own glorious Body.

Will Mr. Lock say that the general Resurrection is not spoken of in these Places? He cannot say it of the first, viz. Rom. 8. 23. without retracting his own express Words in Reasonab. of Christian. p. 206. He cannot say it of the third, viz. Philip. 3. 21. because the immediately foregoing Verfe points us to the Time of Christ's coming from Heaven to judge the World. He may perhaps say it of the second, viz. Rom. 8. 11. because some before him have said that the general Resurrection is not spoken of in that Text, particularly Calvin and Piscator.

Calvin in loc. hath these Words, Morta corpora vocat quicquid abhuc resit in nobis morti obnoxium, ut mos illius status est crasiam nostrum partem hoc nomine appellare. Unde colligimus non de ultima resurrectione que momento fieri haberi sermonem, sed de continua Spiritus operatione, que reliquias carnis paulatim L 4 mortificat.
mortaliscans celestem vitam in nobis instaurat. He
tells us, that by mortal Bodies is understood whatfo-
ever remains still in us obnoxious to Death; which
we may grant him, for our Souls are not obnoxious
to Death; and therefore our mortal Bodies contain
all that remains in us liable to Death. He tells us
also, that it is the Apostle’s usual manner to call the
großer part of us by that Name, i.e. by the Name
of Body; and we may likewise grant him this, for
every one grants that the Body is the großer part
of us. But now what would he gather from this?
Whence (says he) we collect that the last Resurrection
is not spoken of. His Argument put into Form, is
this, The Apostle by mortal Bodies understands what-
soever remains still in us obnoxious to Death; there-
fore the last Resurrection is not spoken of. Mr. Lock
may try, if he pleases, whether he can find out any
thing to tie this Antecedent and Consequent toge-
ther, but I can pronounce that it will not be very
easy for him to do it.

Piscator’s Words are these, Quum certum sit Apo-
stolum hic non loqui de resurrectione corporum sed
anima rum. Tho’ our own Eyes tell us, that the Apo-
istle uses the word Bodies, (not Souls,) yet, if we will
believe Piscator, it is certain that here he speaks not
of the Resurrection of Bodies, but of Souls: And
how is it certain? Mr. Calvin hath said it, that is
all the Assurance that I know of. He that raised up
Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal
Bodies, these are the Apostle’s Words. If when he
says he raised up Christ from the dead, he speaks of
the Resurrection of his Body, not of his Soul, how
can we be certain that when he says, Shall quicken
your mortal Bodies, he speaks of the Resurrection,
not of their Bodies but of their Souls? We see
then, that if Mr. Lock fly to this, to say that the
general Resurrection is not spoken of, Rom. 8. 11. he
will not be much help’d either by Calvin or Piscator.

I con-
I confess that there is one who makes the Words to be capable of a two-fold Sense, and that is Crellius. According to him they may be interpreted either of the future raising or quickening our mortal Bodies, or of the spiritual quickening them, which consists in this, that they live unto Righteousness and unto God. But he makes the former the principal Sense, the latter only secondary.

As Mr. Lock says of the Resurrection of the Body, so he says of the Resurrection of the same Body, viz. That he does not remember any Place in the New Testament where it is so much as mention'd; see his Third Letter, p. 166. And my Answer will be the same, viz. That these very express Words, The Resurrection of the same Body, are not to be found, but there are Words that signify so much, or from which it may be clearly and necessarily inferred. I may instance in the three Places above-cited, Rom. 8. 11, 23. Phil. 3. 21. where St. Paul by our Body, our vile Body, and our mortal Bodies, certainly understood the Bodies which he, and the Romans, and the Philippians, then had, and lays of these, that they should be redeemed, quickened, changed. Who shall change our vile Body, that it (i.e. that vile Body) may be conformed to his glorious Body, Philip. 3. And (as I have observed before) Mr. Lock, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 206. says, That by the Redemption of our Body, Rom. 8. 23. is plainly meant the Change of these frail mortal Bodies into spiritual immortal Bodies at the Resurrection, when this mortal shall have put on immortality, 1 Cor. 15. 54. Thus he. It is observable also, that in his Third Letter, p. 197. when the Words of that Text, 1 Cor. 15. 53, 54. were urged to prove the Resurrection of the same Body, he returns no Answer to them, and did very prudently in returning none: For doth not St. Paul expressly affirm, that this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put
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put on immortality? i.e. this corruptible, this mortal, must be rais'd to a Life of Incorruption and Immortality. And doth he not also repeat it, When this corruptible, &c.? What can be more plain? This corruptible, this mortal, (which are the Apostle's repeated Expressions,) these frail mortal Bodies, (which is Mr. Locke's own Expression,) shall be rais'd, the Light of the brightest Day cannot be more clear.

Some perhaps will say, that Mr. Locke does by no means deny that the same Bodies shall be raised at the last Day; they are his own Words in his Third Letter, p. 195. To which I answer, 1. If he do not deny it, why doth he dispute so earnestly against it? Why doth he endeavour, to the utmost of his Power, to baffle the Arguments that are urged for the Proof of it? A great many Pages of his Third Letter being taken up in the discussing this one Point.

2. He says he does by no means deny it, but does he believe it? If he do believe it, it is not upon the Account of any Argument drawn from Reason, for he tells us more than once in his Essay, that the Resurrection of the Body is above Reason; Reason has directly nothing to do with it, but it is purely Matter of Faith; see his Essay, I. 4. c. 17. §. 33, and c. 18. §. 7. He must then believe it upon the Account of some Arguments drawn from Scripture, or being convinced by some Texts of Scripture which teach this Truth. If so, he deserves to be sharply reprehended, for that he would not acquaint us with Texts of Scripture they are that teach it so clearly. Especially having taken so much Pains to shew that the Places of Scripture allledged by others did not prove it, he ought to have directed us to those Scriptures which did, and by the Cogency of which he was brought to believe it. But the Truth is, he says plainly, that there are no Scriptures that do prove it; affirming that the Scriptures propose to us,
that at the last Day the Dead shall be raised, without determining whether it shall be with the very same Bodies or no; see his Third Letter, p. 168. Tho' therefore he does say, that he by no means denies that the same Bodies shall be rais'd at the last Day, yet it clearly appears that he does not believe that they shall; for, according to him, there are no Arguments either from Scripture or Reason to induce him to believe it.

Mr. Lock's Doctrine concerning Adam's Fall, and our Redemption by Christ, is this: God told Adam, that in the Day that he did eat of such a Tree he should surely die; where, by Death, Mr. Lock can understand nothing but a ceasing to be, the losing all Actions of Life and Sense. Such a Death came on Adam and all his Posterity by his first Disobedience, under which Death they should have lain for ever, had it not been for the Redemption by Jesus Christ, who will bring them all to Life again at the last Day; see for this, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 3, 6, 11. But then he tells us, p. 15, that this being the case, that whoever is guilty of any Sin, should certainly die, and cease to be, the Benefit of Life restored by Christ at the Resurrection, would have been no great Advantage, if God had not found out a way to justifie some. The Reason of which he gives in a Parenthesis, For as much (says he) as here again (i.e. after the Resurrection) Death must have seiz'd upon all Mankind, (all Mankind must have died and ceased to be the second time,) because all had sinned; for the Wages of Sin is every where Death (which Death is a ceasing to be) as well after as before the Resurrection. This Death after the Resurrection is that which, p. 211. he calls the second Death; which (says he) would have left Christ no Subjects, if God had not found out a way to justifie some. As to those who at the Resurrection shall be found unjustified, that second Death shall seize upon them,
and sweep them away; so that, according to Mr. Locke, they shall cease to be, i.e. be annihilated; for I can find out no other sense that these words, cease to be, are capable of: Tho' I confess I do not see that this sense can be consistent with several other expressions which he uses, viz. that dreadful estate of misery, the infinite misery, the exquisite misery of an immortal soul, the perfect misery, the indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, which shall be after this life. But it may be Mr. Locke can put such a sense upon these expressions, and the like to them, viz. everlasting fire, and everlasting punishment, in the words of our Saviour cited by him, Reasonab. of Christian. p. 244, 245. as may consist with ceasing to be, or being annihilated.

When Mr. Locke says, in Essay, 1. 2. c. 21. § 60. that the measures of good and evil govern the choice; and § 70. that the rewards and punishments of another life are of weight enough to determine the choice against whatever pleasure or pain this life can shew; this seems to be not very consistent with that which he had said in the same chapter, § 30. that the greater good in view is not that which determines the will, in regard to our actions; and again, § 35. that good, the greater good, 'tis apprehended and acknowledged to be so, does not determine the will: For what is the meaning of the measures of good and evil, their governing the choice, but that it is govern'd by the greater good and greater evil? Or why are the rewards of another life of weight enough to determine the choice against the pleasures of this, but because they are the greater good? So that in the expressions which he uses, § 60. and 70. he seems to say that the greater good doth determine the choice; whereas, § 30. and 35. he is of the contrary opinion, that it is not of sufficient weight to determine the choice, until our desire rais'd proportion.
proportionably to it, makes us uneasy in the want of it. Let a Man (says he) be never so well persuaded of the Advantages of Vertue, that it is as necessary to a Man who hath any great Aims in this World, or Hopes in the next, as Food to Life; yet till he hungers and thirsts after Righteousness, till he feels an uneasiness in the want of it, his Will will not be determined to any Action in pursuit of this confessed greater Good. Thus Mr. Lock. And I readily grant that a bare View or Prospect of future Rewards and Punishments is not of Force to determine the Choice against present Pleasure and Pain; but it is necessary that we firmly believe them, and be fully convinced of the Certainty of them; as also, that we have them frequently in our Thoughts, and seriously meditate upon the transcendent Happiness of the one, and the unspeakable Miseries of the other, that so our Souls may be inflamed with an hearty Desire of the Rewards, and posses'd with a real Fear and various Dread of the Punishments, before we shall apply our selves in good earnest to work out our Salvation from the Unhappiness of the one, and to secure our Enjoyment of the Felicity of the other. As to that which he says, that Vertue is as necessary to a Man who hath any great Aims in this World, as Food to Life, tho' it will seem a Paradox to some, yet I shall not contradict it; for I know that it is necessary for all Men, yea, as necessary as Food is for our Bodily Sustenance; but I wish, that Mr. Lock could persuade those that aim at great things in this World, that Vertue is so absolutely necessary for them.
A Specimen of Mr. Lock's Way of Answering Persons:

Out of his Essay, l. i. c. 3. §. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19.

Mr. Lock, in the Third Chapter of the First Book of his Essay, hath twice set these Words in his Margin, Lord Herbert's innate Principles examin'd, perhaps because he would have it taken notice of that he durst undertake to grapple with so great a Person. I have therefore taken more especial Notice of that which he (albeit against that Excellent Writer, and also represented it at length to the Reader's View, that he may likewise take the more Notice of it; the rather, because it will afford him a Specimen of Mr. Lock's Way of Answering Authors.

Mr. Lock, in his Essay. l. i. c. 3.
§. 15. When I had writ this, being inform'd that my Lord Herbert had in his Books de Veritate assign'd these
these innate Principles, I presently consulted him, hoping to find in a Man of so great Parts something that might satisfy me in this Point, and put an end to my Enquiry. In his Chapter de Instinctu Naturali, p. 78. Edit. 1656. I met with these six Marks of his Notitia Communes, 1. Prioritas, 2. Independentia, 3. Universalitas, 4. Certitude, 5. Necesitas, i.e. as he explains it, faciunt ad hominis conservationem, 6. Modus conformationis, i.e. affensus nulla interposita mora. And at the latter end of his little Tretise de Religione Laici, he says this of these innate Principis, Adeo ut non uniuscumqvis Religionis confinio attinentur, quae ubique vigent, veritates. Sunt enim in ipsa mente calitus descriptae, nullique traditionibus scriteris scire nobis, p. 3. And Veritates nostra Catholicæ, quæ tanquam indubia Dei efflata in foro interiori descriptae. Thus having given the Marks of the innate Principles or common Notions, and asserted their being imprinted on the Minds of Men by the Hand of God, he proceeds to set them down, and they are these: 1. Esse aliquod supremum numerum, 2. Nomen illud colt debere, 3. Virtutem cum prætate consanguinem optimam esse rationem cultus divini, 4. Relipiscendum esse a peccatis, 5. Dari præmium vel poenam post hanc vitam transaetam. These, tho' I allow them to be clear Truths, and such as, if rightly explained, a rational Creature can hardly avoid giving his Affem to, yet I think he is far from proving that they are innate Impressions in foro interiori descripta: For I must take leave to observe,
some of these Five he enumerates, viz. Do as thou wouldst be done unto, and perhaps some Hundreds of others when well consider'd.

§ 17. Secondly, That all his Marks are not to be found in each of his five Propositions, viz. his first, second, and third Marks agree perfectly to neither of them; and the first, second, third, fourth, and sixth Marks agree but ill to his third, fourth, and fifth Propositions: For besides that we are assur'd from History of many Men, nay, whole Nations, who doubt or disbelieve some or all of them, I cannot see how the third, viz. That Vertue join'd with Piety is the best Worship of God, can be an innate Principle, when the Name or Sound Vertue is so hard to be understood, liable to so much Uncertainty in its Signification, and the thing it stands for so much contended about, and difficult to be known. And therefore this can be but a very uncertain Rule of Humane Practice, and serve but very little to the Conduct of our Lives, and is therefore very unfit to be sign'd as an innate practical Principle.

§ 18. For let us consider this Proposition as to its meaning (for it is the Sense, and not found, that is and must be the Principle or common Notion,) viz. Vertue is the best Worship of God; i.e. is most acceptable to him; which if Vertue be taken, as most commonly it is, for those Actions, which according to the different Opinions of several Countries are accounted laudable, will be a Proposition so far from being certain, that it will not be true. If Vertue be taken for Actions conformable to God's Will, or to the Rule prescribed by God, which is the true and only Measure of Vertue, when Vertue is us'd to signify what is in its own Nature right and good, then this Proposition, That Vertue is the best Worship of God, will be most true and certain, but of very little use in Humane Life, since it will amount to no more but this, viz. That God is pleased with the doing of what he commands, which a Man may certainly
tainingly know to be true, without knowing what it is that God doth command, and so be as far from any Rule or Principle of his Actions as he was before. And I think very few will take a Proposition which amounts to no more than this, viz. That God is pleased with the doing of what he himself commands; for an innate moral Principle writ on the Minds of all Men, (how true and certain soever it may be,) since it teaches so little. Whosoever does so, will have Reason to think Hundreds of Propositions innate Principles, since there are many which have as good a Title as this to be receiv’d for such, which no body yet ever put into that Rank of innate Principles.

§. 19. Nor is the Fourth Proposition, viz. Men must repent of their Sins, much more instructive, till what those Actions are that are meant by Sins are set down: For the Word Peccata, or Sins, being put, as it usually is, to signifie in general ill Actions, that will draw on Punishment upon the Doers, what great Principle of Morality can that be to tell us we should be sorry, and cease to do that which will bring Mischief upon us, without knowing what those particular Actions are that will do so. Indeed this is a very true Proposition, and fit to be inculcated on and receiv’d by those who are suppos’d to have been taught what Actions in all kinds are Sins; but neither this nor the former can be imagin’d to be innate Principles, nor to be of any use if they were innate, unless the particular Measures and Bounds of all Vertues and Vices were engraven in Mens Minds, and were innate Principles also, which I think is very much to be doubted: And therefore I imagine it will scarce seem possible that God should engrave Principles in Mens Minds in Words of uncertain Signification, such as are Vertues and Sins, which amongst different Men stand for different things: Nay, it cannot be in Words at all, which being in most of these Principles very general Names, cannot be understood.
by knowing the Particulars comprehended under them. And in the practical Instances, the Measures must be taken from the Knowledge of the Actions themselves, and the Rules of them abstracted from Words, and antecedent to the Knowledge of Names; which Rules a Man must know what Language forever be chance to learn, whether English or Japan, or if he should learn no Language at all, or never should understand the use of Words, as happens in the Case of dumb and deaf Men. When it shall be made out, that Men ignorant of Words, or untaught by the Laws and Customs of their Country, that it is part of the Worship of God not to kill another Man, not to know more Women than one, not to procure Abortion, not to expose their Children, not to take from another what is his, tho' we want it our selves, but on the contrary to relieve and supply his Wants; and whenever we have done the contrary, we ought to repent, be sorry, and resolve to do so no more: When I say, all Men shall be proved actually to know and allow all these and a thousand other such Rules, all which come under these two general Words made use of, above, viz. Vertues and Sins, there will be more Reason for admitting these and the like for common Notions and practical Principles; yet after all, universal Consent (were there any in Moral Principles) to Truths, the Knowledge whereof might be attained otherwise, would scarce prove them to be innate: which is all I contend for.

Thus far Mr. Lock, and this is all that he answers to the Lord Herbert; it remains that I briefly reply to it.

Ad §. 15. Here in his Text Mr. Lock speaks of the Lord Herbert's assigning innate Principles, giving Marks of these innate Principles, and saying so or so of them: Also in his Margin he hath these Words, Lord Herbert's innate Principles examined; and
and the very same Words are found again in his Margin ad §. 19. And yet I do not observe that the Lord Herbert, either in his Treatise de Veritate, or in that which he intitles Religio Laici, doth as much as once mention either the Expression Innate Principles, or the Word Innate; nor doth Mr. Lock direct us to any Place in either of those Treatises where he doth mention them. 'Tis true, that in his Treatise de Veritate there is frequent mention of Communes Notitiae, and in his Religio Laici of Veritates Catholicæ, and we may suppose that Mr. Lock took these common Notions or Noticeis, and Catholic Verities, to be the same with his innate Principles: In which, if he be mistaken, he both makes the Lord Herbert to say that which he doth not, and withal, while he goes about to prove that those Catholic Verities are not innate Principles, he says nothing at all against that Honourable Person, who never affirm'd them to be so.

If it be said that the Lord Herbert affirms these Catholic Verities to be written by God upon the Hearts of all Men, which is the same with their being innate; I answer, that it is very true that he doth say more than once, that they are in foro interno, or in foro interiori descriptae, & in mente humana a Deo O. M. descriptae; but I question whether it will be for Mr. Lock's Advantage to say, that the being written by God in the Heart, and being innate, are the same; for it may endanger the Overthrow of all that he says concerning innate Principles, and force him to quit his darling Opinion that there are none: For if the Question be put whether there be any Principles written in the Hearts of Men, St. Paul seems to resolve it affirmatively that there are, Rom. 2. 14, 15. When (says he) the Gentiles not having the Law do by Nature the things of the Law, these not having the Law are a Law to themselves, who shew the Work of the Law written in their Hearts,
Hearts, their Conscience bearing witness, and their Thoughts accusing or excusing one another. By the Work of the Law here may be understood either, 1. That Work which the Law prescribes, or the Duties that are required by it; or, 2. The Effect of the Law, or that which it effecteth, i.e. the Knowledge of our Duty, or of that which we ought to do, as also of the contrary, i.e. of that which we ought not to do, as the Apostle saith expressly, Rom. 3:20. By the Law is the Knowledge of Sin; or, 3. By the Work of the Law we may understand (as Origen, Theodoret, and several others, seem to do) the Law itself, i.e. not the Letters and Syllables of the Law, but the Sentence, Summ and Substance of it. Whichsoever of these Expositions we follow, the Sense is in effect the same; so that when St. Paul saith that the Gentiles had the Work of the Law written in their Hearts, his Meaning is, that they had the Sentence and Substance of the Law, or many of the Duties prescribed by it, and the Knowledge of them ingraven or imprinted in their Hearts. And is it not as clear from hence as any thing possibly can be, that they had some Principles or Communis notitia written in their Hearts? And therefore if the Lord Herbert only saith that there are some common Principles or Catholick Truths written in the Hearts or Minds of Men, he saith no more than the Apostle doth; and Mr. Lock, from the Apostle's saying that the Work of the Law was written in the Hearts of the Gentiles, may infer, that he held innate Principles, with as good Reason as he doth from the Lord Herbert's affirming some Truths to be written in the Hearts or Minds of Men, that he held such Principles. And the Truth is, there have not wanted some Prudent and Learned Persons who have expounded these Words of the Apostle of innate Notices or Principles. Quod inquit Paulus Opus scriptum in cordibus, significat har notitias naturales dona
dona esse attributa naturae, & nobiscum nascentia; they are the Words of Melaniphs in loc.

Mr. Lock having transcrib’d five of the Lord Herbert’s Notitiae Communes, adds, These, tho’ I allow them to be clear Truths, and such as, if rightly explain’d, a rational Creature can hardly avoid giving Assent to; yet I think he is far from proving them innate Impressions in foro interiori descriptae: Where I shall not stand to ask Mr. Lock what answers to the Word These, but I must desire the Reader to bear in Mind that he allows all the five Notitiae Communes to be clear Truths, and such as, if rightly explain’d, a rational Creature can hardly avoid giving his Assent to: For this intimates that there is something of them written in the Heart, which is the Reason why we can hardly avoid assenting to them so soon as they are propos’d to us, and we understand the Terms of them. To that which he says farther, that be thinks that the Lord Herbert is far from proving them innate Impressions, I briefly answer, that as Mr. Lock hath not shewn, so I have not found that the Lord Herbert any where uses the Phrase Innate Impressions. It is true that he says that his Cathlick Verities are in foro interiori descriptae; and if it be said that Mr. Lock thinks that he is far from proving them to be so, I reply, that it will best appear whether he be far from proving it or no, by examining the Reasons of Mr. Lock’s thinking so; which we may expect to find, if any where, in the following Sections.

Ad §. 16. Here Mr. Lock observes, that the Five Propositions set down by the Lord Herbert are either not all, or more than all the common Notions writ on our Minds by the Finger of God, if it were reasonable to believe any at all to be so written. To which I answer, If Mr. Lock could prove that the five Propositions mention’d by the Lord Herbert, are more than all those common Notions writ in our Minds by
by the Finger of God, it would follow, that some of them are not such Notions, and that would make directly against the Lord Herbert. But Mr. Lock hath not proved this, and if he had, it would not be for his Advantage, unless he could prove farther that none of them are such Notions; for his known Tenet is, that there are no Notions or Principles at all that are written in Men's Hearts. On the other hand, if Mr. Lock can prove that these Five are not all those common Notions writ in our Minds by the Finger of God, this makes not at all against the Lord Herbert, who never said or thought that they were all; as Mr. Lock might have seen if he had given himself leisure seriously and deliberately to peruse his Treatise de Veritate. He would have found that he very frequently names other common Notions, and particularly he takes notice that there are many Notitiae Communes in Mathematicks, which they call Postulata, (p. 181. Edit. 1633.) and speaks of tota notitiorum communium series, p. 206. He would also have found, that where the Lord Herbert sets down those five Propositions, he is not speaking of common Notions in general, but of those only which concern Religion; Notitiae communes circa Religionem is the Title: Yea, in setting down those five he did not design to give us all the common Notions that concern Religion. He himself plainly tells us this, Notitias communes solenniores circa Religionem premittendas curavi, says he, p. 207. he did not take care to premise all the common Notions that concern Religion, but only the Solenniores. Yea, p. 227. he makes all the Ten Commandments to be Notitiae communes. Mr. Lock says, that this, Do as thou wouldst be done unto, and perhaps some hundreds of others may as justly pretend to be Notitiae communes, as at least some of those five. To which I answer, 1. The Lord Herbert never design'd to exclude Do as thou wouldst be done unto from being Notitiae.
Notitia communis, for he more than once mentioned it as such, viz. p. 54, and 57, and 166. 2. When Mr. Lock says perhaps some hundreds of others, tho' possibly he intended it only as a Rhetorical Flight, yet I question whether the Lord Herbert would have deny'd that there are hundreds of Notitia communis. However, I think it is plain that there is nothing in this Section that makes against that honourable Person, and if Mr. Lock had carefully read his Treatise de Veritate, I believe he would have wholly omitted it.

Ad §. 17. This Section begins thus, All his (i. e. the Lord Herbert's) Marks are not to be found in each of his five Propositions, viz. his first, second, and third Marks agree perfectly to neither of them. Thus Mr. Lock. Now 'tis impossible to make Sense of these last Words, To neither of them; and therefore I conclude that it is a false Print, but know not what Words to substitute instead of them. Perhaps in the Copy it was thus, His first, second, and third Marks agree perfectly to neither of the two first. If this was his Meaning, that we may judge the better of the Truth thereof, we are to know that the six Marks assign'd by the Lord Herbert, are to distinguish the common Notions which we have by natural Instinct from those that we have not without the Help of Discourse. The former are distinguished from the latter by, 1. Priority, 2. Independence, 3. Universality, 4. Certainty, 5. Necessity, 6. The Manner of Conformation. Thus the Lord Herbert. Now (if I do not mistake in correcting the Error of the Press) Mr. Lock says, that the three former Marks do not perfectly agree to the two first Propositions, viz. 1. That there is a God, 2. That he is to be worship'd: Whereby he more than seems to intimate that the three latter Marks do agree perfectly to them. And if so, yea, if only the last of all, i.e. the manner of Conformation, doth agree perfectly
perfectly to them, the three first Marks must agree likewise to them. If the Minds of Men assent to them without delay as soon as they hear them, and consequently without the Help of any Reasoning or Discourse, this Assent must be, 1. before Discourse, 2. independent upon it, 3. there must be an universal Consent to them.

It follows in this Section, that the first, second, third, fourth and sixth Marks agree but ill to his third, fourth and fifth Propositions. As before he did not say that the first, second and third Marks do not agree at all to the first and second Propositions, but only that they do not agree perfectly; so here he does not say plainly the first, second, third, fourth, and sixth Marks do not agree to the three last Propositions, but only that they agree but ill with them. But I would ask Mr. Lock whether the fourth Mark, viz. Certainty, doth not perfectly agree to them? Did he not, § 15. allow them to be clear Truths? And can they be clear Truths, and yet not certain?

But Mr. Lock gives a Reason why five of the six Marks agree so ill to the three last Propositions: For (says he) besides that we are assur'd from History of many Men, nay whole Nations, who doubt or disbelieve some or all of them, I cannot see how the third, viz. that Virtue join'd with Piety is the best Worship of God, can be an innate Principle, when the Name or Sound Virtue is so hard to be understood, liable to so much uncertainty in its Signification, and the thing it stands for so much contended about, and difficult to be known. Thus Mr. Lock. Now to the former part of this Reason there needs no other Answer than this, that tho' Mr. Lock says that we are assur'd from History, yet he doth not acquaint us what or whose History it is that gives us the Assurance. If he had given us the Names of the Historians, or their Words, and the Places where they
they are to be found, we might have examin'd them, and so judged whether they were to his Purpose or no, as also of what Authority his History-writers were. The Lord Herbert, in his Treatise de Veritate, p. 214. tells of one that had said that in a certain remote Country there was no Form of Religion to be found, but adds, that he was confuted by another, who objected to him his Ignorance of the Language of that Country; and certainly if a Man be not skill'd in the Language of a Country, it is not an easie thing for him to know the Religion and Manners of it. But let us suppose that which Mr. Locke says to be true, that History assures us that many Men, nay whole Nations, doubt or disbelieve some or all of the three last Propositions, what will he gain by this? For the Question is not whether some Men may doubt of, or disbelieve these Truths, or some of them; but whether there be any that have not some Notion of them: Even of those that profess themselves Christians, some may possibly doubt of or disbelieve these Truths, but it cannot be said that they have no Notion of them. Lastly, if nothing else could be laid against this Part of the Reason, it only shews that the third Mark, viz. Universality, doth not agree to the three last Propositions, it doth not at all affect the other Marks.

I pass to the latter Part of the Reason, and that is, that Mr. Locke cannot see how the Third, viz. that Vertue join'd with Piety is the best Worship of God, can be an innate Principle. And I do not see how this can be any Reason of that which hath gone before, tho' the word For (unless it be here one of Mr. Locke's privileged Particles) plainly tells us that it was intended for such. Should it be put into Form, how strangely would it look? The third Proposition, viz. That Vertue join'd with Piety is the best Worship of God, cannot be an innate Principle; therefore the first, second, third, fourth, and sixth
sixth Marks agree but ill to his third, fourth, and fifth Propositions. What Cement can be found to join this Antecedent and Consequent together I know not. But let us hear the Reason why Mr. Lock cannot see how the third Proposition fore-mention'd can be an innate Principle. It is because the Name Virtue is so hard to be understood, liable to so much Uncertainty in its Signification, and the thing it stands for so much contended about, and difficult to be known. Now tho' it is true that the Word Virtus hath various Significations, (which may be seen in our Dictionaries,) yet in the Proposition so often mention'd it is easie to be understood, its Signification is certain, and the thing it stands for is easie to be known, and there can be no Contention about it. Yea, Mr. Lock himself, who here speaks of its being hard to be understood, could understand it easily enough when he writ the 15th. Section of this Chapter: There he allows this Proposition to be a clear Truth; but how could he pronounce it to be a clear Truth, if he did not understand the Terms of it? He faith farther, that it is so clear a Truth, that, if rightly explain'd, a rational Creature can hardly avoid giving his Assent to it, which clearly shews that he knew then the right Explication of it, or when it is rightly explain'd: How then comes that which he understood so easily then, to be difficult to be understood now when he writ the 17th. Section?

Mr. Lock concludes this Section thus, And therefore this can be but a very uncertain Rule of Humane Practice, and serve but very little to the Conduct of our Lives, and is therefore very unfit to be assign'd as an innate Practical Principle. But I must conclude contrariwise, seeing the Signification of the Terms of this Proposition is so certain, it cannot but be a very certain Rule of Humane Practice, and of excellent Use for the Conduct of the Lives of Men, and very fit to be assign'd (if not as an innate
innate Practical Principle, yet) as a Practical Principle written in Mens Hearts, which is as much as the Lord Herbert affirms.

Ad § 18. When the Truth of a Proposition is so clear, that the Answerer cannot but see and acknowledge it, the usual way is to add to it, or leave some Words out, or substitute others in the Place of them, and so to mould it into another Form, till he thinks that he can say something to it which may pass for a Confutation with the unwary Reader. Mr. Lock thought it necessary to take this Course, and so he here leaves out the Words join'd with Piety, and represents the Proposition thus, Vertue is the best Worship of God, i.e. (says he) is most acceptable to him. But this, according to the Lord Herbert's Sense of the Word Vertue is most false; for Vertue join'd with Piety is more acceptable to God than Vertue alone, not having Piety its Associate, is. Let the Proposition then stand as it ought to do, and as it is in the Lord Herbert, Vertue join'd with Piety is the best Worship of God, and let us see what Mr. Lock offers.

1. If (says he) Vertue be taken for those Actions, which according to the different Opinions of several Countries are accounted laudable, the Proposition will not be true; i.e. If Vertue be taken for that which is not Vertue, the Proposition will not be true; but if it be taken for that which really is Vertue, (and so the Lord Herbert took it, as Mr. Lock knew very well) it is most certainly true, and confess'd by him a little before to be a clear Truth. How vain then is it (if not contradictory) here to make a Supposition of its being taken in a Sense, which would render the Proposition not true. He says here, that Vertue is most commonly taken for those Actions, which, according to the different Opinions of Countries, are accounted laudable; but he only says it, he does not allege as much as one-Author who takes it so.

Withal,
Withal, if it was true that it is most commonly taken so, yet it is not to the purpose, since Mr. Lock knew that the Lord Herbert did not take it so.

2. If (says he) Virtue be taken for Actions conformable to God's Will, or to the Rule prescribed by God, then this Proposition will be most true and certain: And I do readily grant that it is here taken for Actions conformable to the Will of God, and Rule prescribed by him; but it is to be observ'd, that in this Proposition it is distinguished from Piety, and therefore as the Actions conformable to God's Will, and the Rule prescribed by him, which relate to God, are comprehended under Piety, so under Virtue are comprehended all other Actions that are conformable to the Divine Will and the Rule prescribed us, whether they relate to our Duty towards our Neighbour, or that toward our selves. And this being manifestly the Sense of the Word which the Lord Herbert intended, the Proposition, Virtue joined with Piety is the best Worship of God, must be acknowledged to be most true and certain: But (says Mr. Lock) however true and certain it may be, it is of very little use in Humane Life; and therefore I think very few will take it for an innate moral Principle writ on the Hearts of all Men. To which I answer, that if it depend upon this, I must look upon Mr. Lock's Cause as desperate; for I am so far from granting that this Proposition is of very little use in Humane Life, that contrariwise I positively assert that it is impossible that any general Rule should be of greater use than it is. I challenge Mr. Lock to name any general Rule which is of greater Force to incite Men to the Study and Practice of true Piety and Virtue than this. That Virtue join'd with Piety is the best Worship of God.

But what Reason doth Mr. Lock give of this his strange Assertion, that the fore-mention'd Proposition is of very little use in Humane Life? His Reason
is as strange as his Assertion, because: it amounts to no more than this, that God is pleas’d with the doing of what he commands. To which I answer, 1. Suppose this was true, that it amounts to no more, it would not follow that it is of very little use in Humane Life: For ought not this, that God is pleased with it, be an especial Motive to and Enforcement of that great Duty of taking care to do God’s Commandments? 2. We may admire that Mr. Locke should say that it amounts to no more than this. Doth this, that it is the best Worship of God, amount to no more than this, that God is pleased with it? Surely, it can amount to no less than this, that it is the Worship that best pleases him; as also, that by it we best express our inward Veneration of him, our Relief of his Promises, and Desire to please him; and by it most honour him, &c. He that offereth Praise honoureth me, Psal. 50. viii. and so he that performeth any other Action of Piety, or any virtuous Action, honours or glorifies our Father which is in Heaven; as also, he provokes others, and gives them an Occasion to glorify him, St. Matth. 5. 16.

We see then, that it amounts to much more than this, that God is pleas’d with the doing that which he commands.

Mr. Locke adds, A Man may certainly know this to be true, (viz. that God is pleas’d with the doing of what he commands,) without knowing what it is that God doth command, and so be as far from any Rule or Principle of his Actions as he was before. But whether this be true or no, I am not at all concerned to enquire; it is certain that we cannot know this Proposition (Vertue join’d with Piety is the best Worship of God) to be true, without knowing something of what it is that God commands, for he commands the Practice of the very things express’d in it, viz. Vertue and Piety; yea, these two are the greatest and weightiest things of the Law, or, if you
you will, the two Commandments on which hang all the Law and the Prophets, St. Matth. 22. 40. And we may observe that the Lord Herbert in his Appendix ad Sacerdotes de Religione Laici, sets down this third common Notion or Proposition more largely thus, Virtutem & Piatem una cum fide in Deum amoreque ejus intimo conjunctam, esse precipuam partem cultus Divini. So that here is added express Mention of Faith in God, and an hearty Love of him, which are also things commanded by God. Here is nothing more in this Section that deserves Consideration. As to his Rhetorical Flight concerning Hundreds of Propositions, it hath been touch'd upon before.

Ad §. 19. Here Mr. Lock passes to the Lord Herbert's fourth common Notion or Proposition, That Men must repent of their Sins if they expel or desire to have them forgiven. He grants that it is a very true Proposition, and fit to be inculcated; and othertwore, (viz. in Reasonab. of Christian, p. 256.) he tells us, that the Light of Nature reveal'd to the Heathens this way of Reconciliation, this Hope of Atonement, that God would forgive them, if they acknowledged their Faults, disapproved the Iniquity of their Transgressions, begg'd his Pardon, &c. So that even according to Mr. Lock's Doctrine, this Proposition, Men must repent of their Sins if they would have God atoned and their Sins forgiven, bids fair for being a common Notion or Principle writ in the Hearts of Men. But Mr. Lock says that this fourth Proposition is not much more instructive than the third. To which I answer, That if it be but as instructive as the third, it is very fit to be receiv'd as a common Notion writ in the Hearts of Men: And then surely it is fit to be receiv'd as such when it is acknowledged by Mr. Lock to be more instructive, yea much more instructive when it is set down what those Actions are that are meant by Sins.
I took notice a little before, that Mr. Locke says that this Proposition is fit to be inculcated: But on whom is it to be inculcated? His Words are these, Fit to be inculcated on and received by those who are suppos'd to have been taught what Actions in all kinds are Sins. But if it is fit to be inculcated on and receiv'd by none but those who are taught what Actions in all kinds are Sins, I fear that it is fit to be inculcated on and received by very few: For I doubt there are few that know what Actions in all kinds are Sins. Perhaps Mr. Locke himself has not attain'd to know this; there are perhaps some Actions that are Sins, and yet he doth not think them to be so.

But he proceeds farther, and affirms confidently enough, that neither this (fourth Proposition) nor the former (i.e. the third,) can be imagin'd to be innate Principles, nor to be of any use if they were innate, unless the particular Measures and Bounds of all Virtues and Vices were engraven in Mens Minds, and were innate Principles also, which I think is very much to be doubted. Thus Mr. Locke. Now this seems very high, that no Man can imagine them (or either of them) to be innate Principles, when according to him the Lord Herbert did imagine them to be such; and that they should be of no use, when he himself had intimated before that they are of use: For when, § 18. he says of the third Proposition that it is of very little use in Humane Life, and that it teaches little; this implies that it is of some use, and teacheth something. And § 19. when he faith of the fourth Proposition, that it is not much more instructive than the third, he grants that it is more instructive, tho' not much more. Mr. Locke says, that they cannot be imagin'd to be of any use, unless the particular Measures and Bounds of all Virtues and Vices were engraven in Mens Minds, and were innate Principles also. But suppose
suppose the particular Measures and Bounds of some Vertues and Vices only were engraven on Mens Hearts, and innate Principles, would not these Propositions be of excellent use for inciting us to pra-
ctise those Vertues, and eschew those Vices? And therefore is not Mr. Lock too severe in pronouncing
them to be of no use at all, unless the particular Measures and Bounds of all Vertues and Vices were
innate Principles? But the Truth is, he will not allow that any Measures of Vertue and Vice are in-
nate Principles.

Mr. Lock's next Words are, And therefore I ima-
gine it will scarce seem possible that God should en-
grave Principles in Mens Minds in Words of uncer-
tain Signification, such as are Vertues and Vices,
which amongst different Men stand for different
things. But how the Words And therefore come
here I know not; for I cannot see how this can be
drawn as a Conclusion from that which hath gone
before. He had said a little before, that the word
Sins is usually put to signifie in general ill Actions
that will draw on Punishment upon the Doers. So
that here he makes the Signification of the word
Sins to be certain, and can he infer the thence that it
scarcely seems possible that God should engrave Prin-
ciples in Mens Minds in Words of uncertain Signifi-
cation, as the word Sins is? As to the other word
Vertue, I have shew'd above in answering the 17th.
and 18th. Sections, that the Signification of it is not
uncertain. But does not Mr. Lock give a sufficient
Proof that both the Words are of uncertain Signifi-
cation, when he says that among different Men
they stand for different things? I answer, No; for
tho' some may say, This is a Vertue, when others
may account it a Vice; and this is a Sin or Vice,
when others may say that it is a Vertue; yet by the
words Vertue and Sin they mean the same thing,
viz. by Sin an ill Action, by Vertue a laudable one.

Mr. Lock
Mr. Lock proceeds, and says, *Nay it cannot be suppos’d to be in Words at all, viz. that God engraves Principles in Mens Minds: And to the same Purpose he had said before, in the Beginning of §. 18. It is the Sense and not the Sound that is and must be the Principle or common Notion.* But against whom doth he say this? Not against the Lord Herbert, who is for our having little regard to Words and Names as much as he can be: *Non tam nomina (que si neglexerimus, magnum in sapientia progressum faciemus) quam res ipsa repicientes consensum illum universalem tanquam veritatem indubiam ampliam.* So he de Veritate, p. 40. And therefore he much varies the Words of these two Propositions, *viz.* the third and the fourth. In the third Proposition, instead of *Virtutem cum Pietate conjunctam,* (as he expresseth it in his Religio Laici,) he in his Appendix ad Sacerdot. de Relig. Laici, hath *Virtutem & Pietatem una cum Fide in Deum, Amoreque ejus intimo conjunctam,* and in his de Veritate, p. 215. *Probam facultatum conformitatem,* and in the same de Veritate, p. 220. *Vita sanctitatem.* So his fourth Proposition, in his Religio Laici he expresseth thus, *Resipiscendum esse a peccatis;* but in his de Veritate, p. 217. more largely thus, *Vitiae & scelera quæcunque exiari debere ex penitentia.* Hence it most plainly appears that the Lord Herbert made not Words but the Sense to be the Notitia communis.

We are come at last to Mr. Lock’s Conclusion, which he begins thus, *When it shall be made out that Men ignorant of Words, or untaught by the Laws and Customs of their Country;* but he doth not tell us what is to be made out concerning them; for there is no Verb for this Nominative Case, *Men ignorant of Words,* &c. But I suppose that it is to be supply’d out of that which follows; so that his Meaning is this, *When it shall be made out, that Men*
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Men ignorant of Words, or untaught by the Laws and Customs of their Country, and all Men whatsoever, do actually know and allow that it is part of the Worship of God not to kill a Man, not to know more Women than one, not to procure Abortion, not to expose their Children, not to take from another what is his, tho' we want it our selves, but on the contrary relieve and supply his Wants; and whenever we have done the contrary, we ought to repent, be sorry, and resolve to do so no more: When, I say, all Men shall be prov'd actually to know and allow all these and a thousand other such Rules, all which come under these two general Words, Vertues and Sins, there will be more Reason for admitting these and the like for common Notions and practical Principles. Thus Mr. Lock, who seems to deal very hardly with the Lord Herbert's third and fourth Propositions, in that he will not admit them to be common Notions, or as much as practical Principles, until it be prov'd that all Men in the World, even those that are ignorant of Words, and untaught by the Laws and Customs of their Country, do actually know and also allow of all these and a thousand other such Rules. Methinks if all Men did actually know these, and but half a thousand other such Truths, we might see very great Reason for admitting those two Propositions to be of great use for directing our Practice, and consequently to have a good Title to be accounted practical Rules or Principles. St. Paul, Rom. 1. instanceth in many things, which the Gentiles actually knew to be ill Actions, that will draw on Punishment upon the Doers, and consequently (according to Mr. Lock) Sins; for having enumerated them, from v. 24. to v. 32. he says v. 32. that they knew that those who do such things are worthy of Death. Now must not every one confes that the Lord Herbert's fourth Proposition, That Men must repent if they would have those Sins for given,
given, and escape the Punishment due for them, would have been of very great use to them? Yea, if Men have but Means to know that many things are Vertues or Vices, the two fore-mention'd Propositions must not be deny'd to be pratical Principles, and such as might be very useful in Humane Life, because through their own Default many do not actually know that they are Vertues or Vices. The Lord Herbert makes that golden Rule, St. Matth. 7. 12. Whatever things ye would that Men should do unto you do ye so to them, to be a common Notion writ in the Hearts of Men; and would they but call it frequently to mind, and apply it to particular Actions, by the Light of this they might know whether they have the Nature of Sin or no. The Application of this Rule to particular Actions would help us to the Knowledge of a great part of our Duty toward our Neighbour; and therefore our Saviour says, that this is the Law and the Prophets: All my Duty toward my Neighbour depends upon it, the whole Law concerning that is fulfill'd in it; it is the Foundation of all Justice and Charity to Men. Hence it was that the Emperor Severus Alexander having heard this Sentence from the Jews or Christians (we may rather think Christians) caus'd it to be proclaim'd by the Cryer, and to be writ on the Palace, and on Publick Works; see Ful. Capitolinus in Alexandro Severo. To conclude then according to the Lord Herbert, as that Proposition, They must repent of their Sins, if they would have God aton'd to them, is writ upon the Hearts of Men; so also is this Sentence, All things whatever ye would that Men should do to you do ye likewise to them. By which (if they be not wanting to themselves) they may know in a great measure what particular Actions are Sins, and what they ought to do; so that if that Proposition be not useful and instructive to them, it is their own Fault.

Mr. Locke
Mr. Locke having said, that when all Men shall
be prov’d actually to know and allow all these and a
thousand other such Rules, there will be more Reason
for admitting these for common Notions, lest this
Concession should be too liberal, adds, Yet after all
universal Consent (were there any in Moral Prin-
ciples) to Truths, the Knowledge whereof might be
attain’d otherwise, would scarce prove them to be in-
nate; which is all I contend for. Thus Mr. Locke.
But I do not well understand the meaning of the
latter words, which is all that I contend for. Doth
which relate to that which is here express’d, viz.
that universal Consent to Truths, the Knowledge
whereof might be attain’d otherwise, will scarce
prove them to be innate, so that this is all that he
contends for? Or doth it refer to something not ex-
press’d, Mr. Locke having a Privilege to use Words
otherwise than ordinary Persons are allow’d to do.
To this latter I incline, that it is his meaning, that
he contends for no more than this, that the Lord
Herbert’s Propositions are not innate, tho’ this is
not express’d. But let the one or the other be his
meaning, unless we were certain that by his Notitie
communes or Catholick Truths written in the Minds
of Men, the Lord Herbert meant the same that
Mr. Locke doth by his innate Principles, we cannot
say that that honourable Person is at all concern’d,
or that Mr. Locke’s Conclusion doth contradict any
thing that he hath deliver’d.

Thus I have consider’d all that Mr. Locke hath said
in these five Sections, wherein he hath to do with
the Lord Herbert. And now must it not seem
strange that he should take upon him to examine
what is written by a Person so eminent for his Parts
as well as his Quality, and after all have so little to
say against him? He only toucheth very slightly
upon three of his Propositions, or Notitie communes,
The Reader may also observe Mr. Lock's way of Answering Persons.

How often doth he complain of others, that they make him to say that which he doth not, bidding them shew where it is that he says or pretends such a thing? And may we not likewise ask him where it is, that the Lord Herbert mentions Innate Principles or Innate Impressions?

Another way very frequently us'd is, to single out one or two Particulars, and pretend to say something to them; and then the unwary Reader must believe that the whole is answer'd: So Mr. Lock singles out the third and fourth of the Lord Herbert's Propositions, pretending to say something to them, but takes little or no notice of the other three.

A third way is, to say the same thing that their Adversary doth, and yet to pretend that he is confuting him all the while: And thus doth Mr. Lock, §. 18. and 19, when he inculcates that it is the Sense (and not the Words) that is the Principle or common Notion.
There is a fourth way, which I have let down at large in the Beginning of my Answer to §. 18. and shall not need to repeat.

The last way, most usual with Mr. Locke, is, to pretend that he doth not understand that which he doth; as here it is apparent, that when he writ the 15th Section he knew well enough the Signification of the Word Vertue in the Third Proposition; and yet §. 17. he says it is hard to be understood; and §. 19. pretends it may either have this or that Sense.
Concerning

SOCINIANISM.

Whether it is

Justly Charged upon Mr. Lock.

It is well known, that some have publicly, in
plain and express Words, charged Socinianism
upon Mr. Lock; and that others conceive that there
is too much reason to suspect that he is leaven'd
with many of the Doctrines of Socinus, and his Fol-
lowers. Mr. Lock, on the other hand, seems to be
much displeas'd that he should be loaded with such
an Imputation, yea that he should be so much as
join'd with those that are Enemies of the Doctrine of
the Trinity. He seems also to plead Not Guilty; says,
that there is not one Word of Socinianism in his Book,
(i.e. in his Reasonab. of Christian.) See his Vindica-
tion, p. 13. He professes that he never read the
Racovians, Ibid. p. 22. And his Words in his Second
Vindication, p. 350. are these; I never read a Page
in either of those Socians: he means Slichtingius
and Socinus; though how he can call Socinus a So-
cinian, I know not. Yea, in that Second Vindica-
tion, p. 214. he gives the Socinians a parcel of not
very good Language: I shall transcribe his Words at
large. "As far as I can observe (says he) the same
Genius seems to influence them all (i.e. all the
"differing Sects) even those that pretend most to
Free-
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Freedom, the Socinians themselves. For when it is observed how positive and eager they are in their Disputes, how forward to have their Interpretations of Scripture receive’d for Authentick, though to others, in several places, they seem very much strainity, how impatient they are of Contradiction, and with what Disrespect and Roughness they often treat their Opposers; may it not be suspected that this so visible Warmth in their present Circumstances, and Zeal for their Orthodoxy, would (had they the Power) work in them as it doth in others? They in their Turn would, I fear, be ready with their Set of Fundamentals, which they would be as forward to impose on others, as others have been to impose contrary Fundamentals on them. Thus Mr. Lock, expressing some Dislike of the Temper and Carriage of the Socinians.

But our Question is about their Doctrine, and whether he doth as much dislike that. That we may the better judge of this, the way will be, to enquire first what the Socinians hold; then, how far Mr. Lock doth maintain or disclaim their Doctrines. As to the Doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation of the Son of God, and his Satisfaction, it is so well known what the Socinians hold, that it is wholly needless to cite or set down the Words of any of them: And if Mr. Lock had been pleas’d to let the World know plainly what he held as to these weighty Points, he would have done a great Kindness to others in freeing them from their Jealousies of him, and certainly no small Kindness to himself. But he hath not been willing hitherto to do himself and others this Favour, as I have largely shew’d above, Chap. 8. and 12. But it is not too late to do it still; and therefore I will hope that he may at last condescend so far, as to declare his Thoughts plainly as to these Particulars.
Whereas our Saviour is frequently, in Scripture, call'd the Son of God, the Socinians deny that he is so call'd with respect to his Eternal Generation, or being Begotten of his Father before all World's; as also they deny that his Divinity can be prov'd thence. Thus Enjedinus in Job. 5. 18. Non sequitur, si Christus alio modo sit filius Dei quam homines & Angeli esse naturalem Filium & ex essentia Dei natum; and he had said the same before in Job. 1. 14. So in the Racovian Catechism de Persona Christi, the Answer to the 74th Question is, Ex iis omnibus attributis Christi nullo modo probari posse naturam ejus divinam. Those Attributes or Appellations are, The Son of the Living God, his own Son, his only begotten Son: from these (says the Catechism) Christ's Divine Nature cannot be prov'd. And Socinus himself, contra Wickum, capita 5. throughout his long Answer to the first Argument, makes it his Business to shew, that the Generation of Christ from the Substance of the Father, and that he is the True God, cannot be prov'd from those Appellations; and at last concludes it thus, Arbitror me satis dilucide ostendisse, quomodo Christus sit Dei filius, & quidem unigenitus, quamvis ex ipso Dei substantia generatus non fuerit: And again, Vide possum pui ac cordati omnes qualem vim habet ad probandum quod Christus sit ille unus verus Deus, adversariorum argumentum, ab eo duBum quod Christus sit Dei filius: Thus Socinus. They all agree in this. See Slichtingius Comment. in Job. 1. 50. and 30. 31. Wolzogenius Comment. in Matth. 16. 16. (Neque inde sequitur Petrum agnovisse Christum pro tali Filio Dei, qui ab omni aeternitate ex essentia Patris generatus sit, & ipse nihilominus sit Deus altissimus: fo he.) Crellius Comment. in 1 Pet. 1. 2. (Necesse non est, says he, vocis Filii Dei significatum ab aeterna quadam ex substantia, Patris generatione arcêfère;) not to mention many others. In like manner Mr. Lock, though this Appel-
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lation. The Son of God occurs so frequently in the Texts which he cites in some of his Writings, yet never expounds it as importing the Deity of Christ, but draws it to another sense. In his Second Vindication, p. 360, &c. he alleges S. Joh. 1. 34. and 3. 35, 36. also S. Joh. 1. 50. S. Luk. 4. 41. S. Mar. 3. 11. S. Matt. 16. 16. S. Joh. 11. 27. S. Luk. 22. 70. S. Matt. 27. 54. (not Luke 27. 54. as by the Fault of the Press it is in Mr. Lock) and of all these Texts he says, p. 369, that we must give up this Argument (viz. from Christ's being called the Son of God) and allow that this Phrase in these places does not necessarily import the Deity of our Saviour, and the Doctrine of the Eternal Generation; unless we think that the Eternal Generation of Jesus the Son of God was a Doctrine that had entered into the Thoughts of John the Baptist, Nathaniel, S. Peter, S. Martha, the Sanhedrim, yea even of the Roman Centurion and the Soldiers that were with him watching Jesus: and he supposes that few think this. It does not necessarily import, says Mr. Lock, just as Crellius says, Necesse non est. And particularly of S. Luk. 22. 70. he says, that if the Son of God be to be taken for a Declaration of his Deity, common and coherent Sense will hardly be made of it. As to S. Luk. 4. 41. and S. Mar. 3. 11. he asks, Who can entertain such a Thought, as that the unclean Spirits had a mind to acknowledge and publish to the People the Deity of our Saviour? And as to S. Matth. 16. 16. he says, that S. Peter can be taken in no other sense, but bare-ly to signify that Jesus was the Messiah; as he also faith, that the Phrase of the Son of God is us'd by S. Martha, Joh. 11. 27. to signify the Messiah, and nothing else.

Farther, the Socinians make these Expressions, the Messiah, and the Son of God, to have the same Signification. Sapissime in Scripturis Filius Dei & Christus idem denotant; so Crellius in 1 Pet. 1. 3. Ut adeq
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adeo nomen Christus seu Messias & nomen Filius Dei ex usu Judaorum pro eodem sumeretur. Wolzogenius in S. Matth. 16, 16. comparing this place with Mar. 8. 29. and Luk. 9. 20. and also alledging Joh. 1. 49. and Luk. 22. 67, 68, 69. Idem est Messiam seu Christum & Filium Dei esse. Enjedinus in S. Matth. 28. 19. So Slichtingius in S. Joh. 1. 50. Ex Nathanaelis confessione videmus Filii illius Dei & Regis illius Israel, i.e. Christi titulum, idem significare. Ustitatum enim erat apud Hebraeos Messiam vocare Filium Dei. Again, in Comment. in S. Joh. 20. 31. Christi & Filii Dei titulus pro synonymis uspantur. Thus also Socinus himself cont. Wickum, cap. 5. in Resp. ad Argumentum. 1. Perspicuum est idem reipsea esse Christum & illum Filium. Idem est esse illum Regem Israelis quod esse Christum. Caiphas & alii Iudei alius nibil Filii Dei nomine intellexerunt quam Christum; so he, alledging Matth. 26. 63. Mar. 14. 61. S. Joh. 20. 31. together with the places above-cited by Wolzogenius. I shall only add Volkelius de Vera Religione, l. 5. c. 12. where having compar'd Matt. 16. 16. with Mar. 8. 29. and Luke 9. 20. he concludes thus, Ut facile apparet in locis istis Filium Dei & Christum esse eandem habere significationem: and he also adds, that the same is manifest (viz. that they are Expressions of the very same thing, or that have the same signification) from Luke 22. 67, 70. Joh. 1. 50. and sundry places in S. Joh. being compar'd. And thus Mr. Lock, The Son of God and the Messiah are one in signification, Second Vindicat. p. 353. Messiah and the Son of God were synonymous Terms at that time among the Jews, Reasonab. of Christian, p. 50. Confessing Jesus to be the Son of God, and the same with confessing him to be the Messiah; those two Expressions being understood among the Jews to signify the same thing, Ibid. p. 96. And therefore almost everywhere in his Reasonab. of Christian, when he allledges any place where Christ is said or confessed to be
be the Son of God, he interprets it of his being the Messiah. Finally, he proves that these Titles have the same Signification, by comparing S. Matt. 16. 16. with S. Mar. 8. 29. and S. Luke 9. 20. and by those other Texts which are made use of by Socinus, Wolzogenius, and Volkelius, to that purpose: See Reasonab. of Christian. p. 102. and otherwhere. Please to see also what I have said above, Chap. 7.11.

Enjedinus, in Matth. 28. 19. faith, That no other Faith was requir'd of the Gentiles when they were Baptiz'd, than to believe that Jesus is the Messiah or Son of God. Nulla alia fides sicut requisita a gentibus cum baptizabantur, quam ut crederent Jesus esse Messiam, seu Christum, vel Filium Dei. He also tells us, that this is that which all the Writers of the New Testament urge, yea, that it was the Scope and Design of writing the History of the Gospel, alleging S. Joh. 20. 31. and that this is the Faith by which the Gentiles were made the People and Children of God. Thus Enjedinus. Now the Reader needs not be admonish'd of how near Affinity hereto that is which Mr. Lock so earnestly and frequently inculcates, viz. that all that was to be believ'd for Justification, was no more but this single Proposition, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. Reasonab. of Christia. p. 47. that S. John knew nothing else requir'd to be believ'd for the attaining of life, but that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God. Ibid. p. 194. that this is the sole Doctrine pressed and requir'd to be believ'd in the whole Tenor of our Saviour's and his Apostles preaching. Ibid. p. 195. and that the Gospel was writ to induce Men to believe this Proposition, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah; for Proof of it alleging S. Joh. 20. 31. as Enjedinus doth. Some of the Socinians (as Crellius Comment. in 1 Corinthians. 15. 14. and Wolzogenius in Alts 8. 37.) make this Proposition, Jesus Christ is the Son of God, to be a brief Summary of the Christian Faith or
Charged upon Mr. Lock.

or Profession, comprising many things in few words. And if they who say that this is all the Faith that is required, had plainly declared that they took it in this comprehensive sense, as a brief Summary of all that we are required to believe concerning Christ, as that he is the only Son of God, our Lord, was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, &c. (as in the Creed) it would not have given so much Offence. Therefore it would not be amiss if they would make such a plain Declaration of their Meaning now.

Socinus, in his Prelectiones Theologica, cap. 2. says, that there is not any Opinion or Notion of a Deity naturally implanted in the Mind of Man. Receptio

bodie sententia est homini naturaliter ejusque animo insitam esse Divinitatis alicujus opinionem, quam sententiam nos falsam esse arbitramur. And one Reason why he thought thus, was, because not only some single Persons, but also whole Nations, are found, which have no sense or suspicion of a Deity. He instances in the Province of Brazil (or Bresil, as he calls it) and appeals to Historians for the Truth of it. How near Mr. Lock comes to this, the Reader may judge, who in his Essay, l. 4. c. 10. §. 1. says expressly, that God hath stamp'd no original Characters on our Minds, wherein we may read his Being; and his first and principal Reason for this, l. 1. c. 4. §. 8. is, because besides the Atheists taken notice of among the Ancients, there have been whole Nations amongst whom hath been found no Notion of a God. He instances, as in other places, so in Brazil, and appeals to Navigators and Historians for the Truth of it.

The Socinians say, that the Soul, separated from the Body, hath no Sense, cannot perform any Action, or enjoy any Pleasure, till the Resurrection. Smacius frequently inculcates this, Spiritus a corpore separatus nullo sensu praeditus est, & nulla voluptate fruitur ante adventum Christi. And again, Spiritus
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sine corpore nullas actiones exercere potest. So Smal-
cius de extremo judicio, §. 3, and in Examine Erro-
rum, Error. 88. Non credimus Spiritum qui ad De-
um, redit alicquid sentire, aut beatitate aliqua frui-
ant Christi adventum. In like manner, Socinus him-
self, in his 5th Epistle to Volkelius, declares it to be
his firm Opinion, Post bane vitam animam hominis
non ita per se subsistere, ut premia illa paenitente sen-
tiat, vel ista sentiendi sit capax. See also to this
purpose, Crellius in Heb. 11. 40. And Slightingius
in 1 Cor. 15. 32. As to Mr. Lock, they that have leis-
ure may enquire whether his words in his Reasonab.
of Christian. p. 6. do not look toward this, when
he says, that Death is the losing of all Actions of
Life and Sense. For it is not easy to conceive how
this can be true, unless when Men die the Soul lose
all Actions of Life and Sense as well as the Body
doth.

Socinus and his Followers deny Original Sin, and
the Corruption of our Nature, because of Adam's
Transgression. Concludimus nullum peccatum origi-
nale esse, i.e. ex peccato illo pramenti nullam
labem aut pravitatem univoxo humano generi neces-
sario ingressum esse sine infinitam quodammodo fusile:
So Socinus in his Praelectiones Theolog. cap. 4. He is
follow'd by the Racoian Catechism, Cap. 10. Quaest.
Peccatum originis nullum prorsus est, nec e Scriptu-
ra id peccatum originis doceri potest: Et lapsus Ade,
cum unus altus fuerit; vim eam quam depravare ipsam
naturam Adami, multotinus vero posteriorum ipsum
posset, habere non potuit. To the same purpose are
the Words of Volkelius, De vera Religione, l. 5. c. 18.
Mr. Lock is not so positive as they are; but he says,
that the New Testament doth not any where take no-
tice of the Corruption of Humane Nature in Adam's
Posterity, nor tells us that Corruption seiz'd on all
because of Adam's Transgression, as well as it tells
us so of Death.
The Socinians say, that the same Bodies shall nor arise at the general Resurrection. *Corpora hæc, quæ nunc circumferimus, resurrectura non credimus, sed aliæ nobis danda esse ab Apostolo edocti statuimus.* So Smalcius in Examin. Errorum. Err. 89. *Corpora in quibus reviviscēnt & veniēnt mortui non ea sunt corpora in quibus mortales viserunt, & quorum corruptione mortui sunt, sed illa sunt longe illis praestiora,* Schlingius Comment. in 1 Cor. 15. 37. Illi enim argumentationis Apostolica consellium, qui in eisdem numero corporibus nos aliquando resurrecturos statuunt, Crullis Comment. in 1 Cor. 15. 13. They that please may also consult Volkelius De vera Religione, A3. c. 35. As to Mr. Lock, a large Account hath been given above, Chap. 31. of what he faith as to this Particular; viz. the same Bodies being rais'd. Where we may also see that he proceeds farther than perhaps the Socinians do, saying, that he finds no such express words in the Scripture as that the Body shall rise or be raised. See the Third Letter, p. 210. To which something hath been said in the foregoing Chap. 31, and now, by way of farther Answer, I desire that 1 Cor. 15. 42, 43, 44 may be consulted. It is sown in Corruption; it is rai'sd in Incorruption; it is sown in Ignorancy, it is rai'sd in Glory; it is sown in Weakness, it is rai'sd in Power; it is sown a natural Body, it is rai'sd a spiritual Body. Now I ask, What is it that is rai'sd in Incorruption, in Glory, in Power, and a Spiritual Body? Mr. Lock will surely answer, that it is the Body. And if the Body be so necessarily understood, it is the same as if it was express'd. Besides, the words v. 44. may be rendered, *The Body is raised Spiritual;* and so we have the express words, that the Body is raised.

The Wicked's suffering eternal Torments after this Life, is deny'd by the Socinians. *Impios futuros immortales, nempe in eternum opprobrium, nec usquam sacrā*
Whether Socinianism, &c.

Sacra Litera comprobant, nec quicquam ex illis fieri posse videtur, unde Sententia illa probari posse: Só Smalcius in Refut. Frantzii, p. 415. Ut Deus in omnibus justitiæ tenax est, ita hic quoque super neminem extendet panem meritis ejus majorem. Nulla autem esse possunt peccata tam graviæ, quæ sempiternis cruciatibus possunt aequari. Wolzogenius Comment. in Matth. 24. 46. The-like hath Ernestus Somnerus in his Demonstration, intitled, Demonstratio Theologicæ & Philosphopica, quod æterna impiorum supplicatione non arguant Dei justitiam, sed injustitiam. As to Socinus himself, that he was of the same Opinion, appears sufficiently from his Disputation with Pucciæus, and the Letters which past between Volkelius and him about it. What Mr. Lock's Opinion is as to this, I shall not determine: On the one hand his making the Death which was threatened to Adam, and which he says is the Wages of Sin as well after as before the Resurrection not to be an eternal Life in Misery, or the being kept alive in perpetual exquisite Torments, but a Ceasing to be, may incline us to think that in this great Point he holds the same that the Socinians do: See his Reasonab. of Christian. p. 5, 6, 15. On the other hand, How far his mentioning infinite Misery, exquisite Misery, unspeakable Punishments, perfect Misery, Tribulation and Anguish, Indignation and Wrath which shall be after this Life, and his transcribing the words of our Saviour in which he speaks of everlasting Fire and everlasting Punishment, may argue that he doth not hold with them, I know not.

FINIS.